

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, May 25, 1993

The House met at 12 noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

May 25, 1993.

I hereby designate the Honorable G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

THOMAS S. FOLEY,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Remind us, gracious God, of the uncertainty of life and our responsibility to be good stewards of the time and opportunities before us. May we be the people You would have us be in the days ahead and see the joyous opportunities to live lives that truly take seriously the responsibilities each has been given. May we be faithful custodians of all the blessings that have been given to us, whatever those gifts might be, and so may we use our time to serve people in their needs and seek reconciliation and peace with all. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EVERETT] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. EVERETT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution designating May 30, 1993, through June 7, 1993, as a "Time for the National Observance of the Fiftieth Anniversary of World War II."

NEED FOR CAPITAL PUNISHMENT MARKED BY MURDER OF MICHIGAN PRISON GUARD

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, a prison guard at a Lansing correctional facility was beaten to death by a bunch of inmates. The saga of police officers in America being killed continues to go on at a record pace, and to make it worse, we now approach a record of 25,000 murders in America this year.

Prisons are overcrowded, and taxpayers are bankrupt trying to pay for it.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to enact the death penalty for first degree murder. We have been coddling murderers too long, and we have been, in fact, denying victims any rights or protections. What do we now tell this family in Lansing, MI? That the murderer who killed your father and who had a lifetime sentence will be given another lifetime sentence?

This is unbelievable, and nobody in Washington is doing one thing about it. It is time, Mr. Speaker, to stop reading tombstones all over America and legislate and create some policy on first degree murder.

ODE TO A NEW DEMOCRAT

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, this is an "Ode to a 'New Democrat'" by DICK ARMEY:

Bill Clinton was a president.

Whose hair was white as snow.

And everywhere Bill Clinton went,

His hair was sure to grow!

To California he did fly

To talk of "sacrifice,"

While out there he cut his hair

And boy, did it look nice!

Christophe! boarded "Hair Force One"

And charged two hundred bucks.

See, your new taxes ain't so bad,

Just two-and-a-half haircuts!

So pony up now, middle class,

He knows for you what's good.

His degrees are from the Ivy League,

His hair, from Hollywood!

Perhaps we've learned a lesson here.

Of "new Democrats" beware.
They care less about your tax burden,
Than they do about their hair.

TAXGATE

(Mr. EWING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, the White House has vowed never to have another week like they had last week.

Remember last week we had both Hairgate and Travelgate, two little public relations gaffes that embarrassed the administration.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the White House must prefer to have more weeks like this week. And this week we are going to have Taxgate.

Yes; this week the Democrats in the House will attempt to pass the largest tax increase in history. Taxgate will do more to harm the middle-class taxpayer than Hairgate, Travelgate, and all the other gates combined.

And after the Democrats pass this tax bill, you will see the White House claim this passage as a victory for the President. With victories like this, who needs defeats?

Mr. Speaker, we need an opportunity to stop the Clinton tax plan. Give us a vote on the Btu tax and the Social Security tax.

Let us stop Taxgate before it becomes a real scandal to the American taxpayer.

STRAIGHT TALK ABOUT TAXES AND ECONOMICS

(Mr. WISE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed hearing the limerick that was just cited by the gentleman on the other side of the aisle, but I have got to be honest with you: After you hear some of their proposals for deficit reduction, it is enough to curl your hair as well. I would resort to poetry, too.

Let us talk about what this is really all about. This is about, yes, a very large deficit reduction package, of which half, 1 to 1 at least, indeed a little better, comes from spending cuts. And they are going to be tough cuts.

Let us also be honest and forthcoming and say, yes, there are tax increases in there. Sixty-five percent come upon those who make over \$200,000 a year, 70 percent come up on those who make over \$100,000, and

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

those under a certain level will not see a tax increase because of an earned income tax credit.

Finally, let us also recognize what the other side is not telling us. They are not telling us how they brought us a \$4 trillion deficit that we are having to contend with. They are not telling us about the lowest economic growth in the last 4 years since the Great Depression. They are not telling us about the lowest number of jobs created.

It is time to talk straight, Mr. Speaker.

WORKING AMERICANS CLIPPED BY THE BTU TAX

(Mr. HASTERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, if you were in the air last Thursday, especially if you were flying to the Los Angeles airport, you might have been delayed because Air Force One was sitting on the tarmac while our President was getting a \$200 Hollywood haircut. The rest of America was squirming, squirming about the President's Btu tax.

In my State of Illinois the tax foundation says that that very tax will cost 21,581 jobs, jobs to the middle class, to working people.

Mr. Speaker, I think maybe the American people are the ones getting clipped after all.

TIME TO ABANDON SUPPLY-SIDE ECONOMICS, PUT PEOPLE BACK TO WORK

(Mr. GEJDENSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, there is an interesting sleight of hand going on. It is the kind of performance that Nehru would have loved. While our economy is in deep trouble, there are some who would like to get the people in this country to look to the side someplace and not to the central issue.

The alternative that has been proposed to the President's proposal on reviving our economy would increase the burden on senior citizens and the poor, increase the burden on the middle class, and, yes, once again, a la the Reagan and Bush years, give a tax break to the oil companies and the utilities and the wealthiest in America.

The President has come forward with a proposal that is tough. It is not the 1980's. We cannot cut taxes on the rich all over again, once more, as you would like. It is time to undo the damage of supply-side economics and put Americans back to work with a program of diversification and conversion and investing in the future of this country.

Mr. Speaker, enough of this foolishness. Let us move forward with the President's proposal.

FLUSHING THE BTU TAX

(Mr. LINDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, while President Clinton's tax proposal may not be worth the paper it is printed on, if his tax plan is passed, that paper will be worth a good deal more.

That's because with the President's middle-class energy tax, the cost to make paper will increase considerably.

In fact, every consumer product will cost more. From grocery goods to toilet paper, the inflationary impact of the Btu tax will be devastating.

The direct costs of the energy tax per family will be \$471. The indirect costs are incalculable.

Mr. Speaker, we do not really need more taxes. The middle class pays enough. The poor pay enough. They cannot stand another hit.

We especially do not need an energy tax which will spur inflation and slow our economy.

Before Bill Clinton increases the cost of toilet paper, we should flush this tax.

We need a vote to strike the Btu tax.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

THE PRESIDENT IS WRONG

(Ms. PRYCE of Ohio asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the line out of the Clinton White House is if you vote against the President's tax bill, you betray the President.

I disagree. I say to my Democratic colleagues you do your President a favor if you vote down his tax proposal.

The President is lost, and he is too proud to ask for directions. He is heading down the wrong road, a road which will lead to higher inflation, higher interest rates, and slower economic growth.

Defeating the President's tax bill is the best way to tell him he is going the wrong direction. How do we know that his way is the wrong way? Because it was the same route taken by Jimmy Carter in 1976.

It is no crime to tell the President that he is wrong. This is not a monarchy. It is not a dictatorship. It is a democracy. And when the President is wrong, it is the duty of every American of any political party to tell him so.

Mr. Speaker, the President is wrong. We do not need more taxes. I urge my

Democratic colleagues to send that message to President Clinton by voting against his tax bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S SUMMER JOBS PROPOSAL

(Mr. TOWNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, just a few days ago the Mayor of the City of New York addressed the Subcommittee on Human Resources. He came for a hearing, and indicated that in New York City he had over 100,000 young people that had signed up for summer jobs, and that he only had enough money for 30,000 summer jobs, which means that 70,000 young people will go without jobs this summer.

When we look at the package that has been put forth in terms of job programs, \$314 million, this would mean only an additional 10,000 jobs for the city of New York's young people, which means that there will be 40,000 young people with jobs and 60,000 with no jobs.

Mr. Speaker, something else that should be noted here is that this package creates 12,000 fewer summer jobs than the last year of the Bush administration.

As Mayor Dinkins stated, \$314 million for summer jobs is totally inadequate, and we must face up to this problem, and, as Spike Lee from my district said, we now must do the right thing.

TIME IS TICKING AWAY

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, this patriot pays enough: No more taxes.

Last week I came to the floor with this message from the patriots of America. Well, the Democrats haven't gotten the message yet. The minutes are ticking away till the Democrats bring up their tax bill to the floor, the largest tax increase in American history. And who will be hurt the most by the new taxes—the middle class.

I specifically recall hearing candidate Clinton on the campaign trail claiming he was going to cut taxes for the middle class. On October 19, 1992, he said "I will not raise taxes on the middle class to pay for my programs." It seems that since becoming President, Bill Clinton is experiencing memory loss. Now President Clinton is pushing a tax bill complete with an energy tax and new taxes on Social Security—taxes aimed at the middle class to pay for more spending programs.

More taxes, more spending, and a bigger government. That's what President Clinton's tax bill is all about. The min-

utes are ticking away for the middle class Americans. Prepare to open your wallets and watch your money disappear, because the Democrats' tax bill is gonna getcha.

AMERICAN PUBLIC, NATION'S JOB-LESS HOPE FOR MEANINGFUL LEGISLATION

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, this past Sunday, the people in my home State of New Jersey had it all spelled out for them on the editorial page of the Star-Ledger, a statewide newspaper. "When you're out of a job, it's a recession. When I'm out of a job, it's a depression." With New Jersey's unemployment rate at 9.1 percent, the highest in the Nation, nothing could ring truer.

This week I am going to have to answer to real people at home, not statistics. I am going to have to tell the jobless people on the streets of Perth Amboy, Newark, Elizabeth, and Jersey City that although I have each time answered the President's call and each time made the tough choices, all we will have to show for it is a share of an anemic, skin-and-bones stimulus.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the President to keep fighting for people who want to work but can find none. I want to implore him to keep fighting to give them a chance, and not to let their hopes die amidst Republican rhetoric on the plush seating of the Senate Chamber, where everybody already has a job. Mr. President, put forth a meaningful job package, and the American public will be with you.

AN ODE TO THE MIDDLE CLASS

(Mr. DOOLITTLE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, "An Ode to the Middle Class":

Roses are red,
Daffodils are flaxen
And President Clinton
Just keeps on taxin'
He promised the middle class
They'd get a break
But now all they've got
Is one big headache!
Their wallets are empty
And they find it strange
All that's in their pockets
Is some very small change.
And soon these poor taxpayers
Will have new burdens on their backs
If President Clinton
Gets his energy tax.
They're taxed for the deficit
They're taxed for the streets
They're taxed from their heads
Way down to their feet!
They're taxed, some may say
To cure all our ills—

But the truth of it is
they're taxed to the gills!

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RESTRICTING HAZARDOUS WASTE INCINERATOR SITES

(Mr. HOLDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight legislation Congressman CLINGER and I have introduced concerning hazardous waste incinerators. And, I want to thank Mr. CLINGER for his leadership and hard work on this legislation.

The issue of hazardous waste incineration is of local and national importance. Local to my constituents in Northumberland County who are faced with this problem every day—and national to us since we have the ability to set requirements for incinerators.

One mile from my district is the site of a proposed hazardous waste incinerator. This site happens to be situated across the street from Allenwood Federal Prison.

As you can guess, this situation poses a tremendous threat to the community which would be endangered by an incinerator malfunction or other catastrophe. Residents, prison guards, and prisoners would have to be evacuated, and prison officials have testified that an evacuation could not be accomplished swiftly and safely. I do not want to put the people of the Susquehanna Valley at risk.

There seems to be no rhyme or reason of how we can allow the siting of these incinerators near a prison, since a hazardous waste incinerator does not make a good neighbor to any prison.

To address this problem, Mr. Clinger and I have introduced legislation creating a 2-mile buffer zone around Federal prisons, prohibiting hazardous waste facilities from being built within this area.

This legislation is a first step in bringing some common sense to the siting of hazardous waste incinerators, since the risks are too costly for the people that live near these sites.

THE BTU TAX: HITTING THE POOR THE HARDEST

(Mr. EVERETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, a column in yesterday's Roll Call said it all: "Clinton's Btu Tax Would Be Hardest on Poor Families."

That is right, Mr. Speaker. Despite Bill Clinton's warmed-over class warfare rhetoric, his proposed energy tax would hit the poor harder than anybody.

According to Bob Eckhardt, a former Democratic Congressman, poorer fami-

lies pay four to five times more for energy per capita than rich and middle class families.

By increasing the costs of energy on these families, Bill Clinton's tax makes life harder for the working poor. Add in inflation, and you have a tax that will really sock it to poorer families. The working poor will feel the pain when Bill Clinton and the Democratic majority pass their energy tax.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you will give us a vote to strike the Btu tax. We must work to lift this crushing tax from every American family.

And to my Democratic friends, especially those Democratic freshmen who promised a middle class tax cut, to all my friends who are considering voting for this attack on the poor and working poor—are you willing to go back to your districts and tell them you broke your promise and voted for this mess?

□ 1210

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S COMMITMENT TO STRENGTHENING AMERICA

(Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's deficit reduction and investment plan is the long-awaited antidote to counteract the past 12 years of Reagan-Bush trickle-down, voodoo economics—which has caused average Americans, pocketbooks to run dry while cursing opportunities to those most in need.

It is high time we break this devastating spell. America can no longer afford to simply maintain the status quo along with the inevitable inequities such a situation perpetuates.

The President's plan reverses this disastrous do-nothing trend by locking in nearly \$500 billion in deficit reduction and bringing middle-class fairness back to our Tax Code. At the same time, the President's package injects much-needed investments into important programs such as Head Start, Women, Infants, and Children, childhood immunizations, and family preservation.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton came to office with a firm commitment to putting people first. Indeed, the President has worked diligently to keep this commitment in the face of obstinacy and cynicism. People first, not big business, not the rich, but the people who made this country great: the worker, the homemaker, the student, the senior citizen, the average people who make this country what it is today.

NIH REAUTHORIZATION

(Ms. SNOWE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to rise in support of final passage of the conference report on the National Institutes of Health reauthorization.

There is no question what passage of this legislation, and its subsequent signing into law, will mean for American women:

It means there will not be any more breakthrough studies that include 22,000 men and no women.

It means that women's health will no longer be an asterisk in America's medical textbook.

It means that women will finally have answers to the questions we've been asking for the past many years that can mean the difference between life and death.

Members of the House, the consciousness of American women has been raised regarding the dearth of research on their particular health needs. And yet, as the incidents of breast and cervical cancer and osteoporosis continue to rise, more and more women are asking questions about their health out of concern and outright fear.

Mr. Speaker, the answer can no longer be, "We simply don't know." We must help to restore their dignity, and respect their desire for simple parity in the area of health research and funding.

The increased funding contained in this legislation for research on osteoporosis, breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer, contraceptives and infertility, will provide the scientific underpinnings that will give women the answers they desperately need and deserve.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Members of the House to support passage of the NIH reauthorization today. It is the right prescription for a problem which is long overdue for a solution.

A WILLINGNESS TO PAY TAXES IF THE PURPOSE IS CLEAR

(Mr. MAZZOLI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, it has been my experience to observe that people do not like to pay taxes. That is a truism. That is a self-statement.

Occasionally, however, if the goal for which people are requested to raise taxes is sufficiently clear and sufficiently important, people are willing, in fact, to pay taxes.

At home in Louisville, some years ago, we voted for earmarked taxes for local public transit. I understand the State of California has passed additional gasoline taxes to improve the road system and uncork the traffic jams there.

President Clinton's proposal that comes up this week, the reconciliation

plan, does have in it tax increases, but because they are targeted for deficit reduction and because they go into a trust fund for that purpose and because some type of a mechanism for either capping entitlements or for establishing an alarm bell system to monitor entitlement growth will be included, the money which is raised, along with the spending cuts which are included, will go to deficit reduction.

So I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that while people do not like to pay taxes, they will do so, if the purpose is good enough and the method is correct, and that is what we have in this reconciliation bill.

THE BTU TAX

(Mr. BACHUS of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary visited Birmingham, AL, and in a speech in my hometown she characterized President Clinton's Btu tax as a, and I use her quote, "pissant tax."

Now, Secretary O'Leary used this vulgar term to indicate that this tax was nominal, unimportant or insignificant. But, Mr. Speaker, this tax will take \$500 out of the pockets of the average Alabama family.

That may not seem like a lot of money to Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary, but I can tell my colleagues that that is a lot of money to the average Alabama family. It is money that these struggling families need to pay for groceries for a month or more, to pay rent payments. When their children are sick, this is money that they need to take them to the hospital or for medical treatment.

In short, this tax is not nominal to the people in my district. Middle-class families are struggling. They need the tax relief promised by President Clinton, not more taxes. They do not have an extra \$500. To my freshman Democrats, I ask, is \$500 a nominal or insignificant tax to the families of their district?

Do the families in their district have \$500 extra? Do they need tax relief or a tax increase? Before you vote for the Btu tax, consider these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying that I ask my freshman Democrats, before they vote for this tax, are the families in their districts, do they need to pay more taxes or less taxes?

THE BIGGEST TAX INCREASE IN AMERICAN HISTORY

(Mr. ROTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, today the Democrats are beginning their big push

to pass Clinton's \$246 billion tax package, the largest tax in American history.

The sum of \$29 billion of the new tax will be taken from senior citizens. The senior citizens tax on Social Security benefits will be as high as 85 percent.

I have an amendment to stop the \$29 billion tax raid on our senior citizens. I ask every Congressman to help me protect Social Security from the big spenders, and my amendment will do just that.

And get this, at the same time that the Clinton administration is asking to tax Social Security, they are asking for an increase, an increase in foreign aid. I ask, isn't it time for us to take care of our own people and our own problems first for a change? Tax, tax, tax, spend, spend, spend is not the correct approach.

A senior citizen from Minocqua, WI, put it best, in my annual questionnaire, when he wrote back and said, "If it were up to Bill Clinton, he would tax the very air we breathe."

I can only add, and send the tax dollars overseas.

HAZARDOUS WASTE SAFETY ZONE LEGISLATION

(Mr. CLINGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week I introduced H.R. 2209, along with my colleague Congressman TIM HOLDEN, to address a major public safety concern. Under current law, hazardous waste incinerators can be built and operated literally next door to Federal prisons. This raises very serious health and safety issues for surrounding communities, Federal prison staff, and prisoners given the potential for a hazardous waste accident.

This bill provides a 2-mile safety zone around Federal prisons within which no hazardous waste facility could be built that could require the evacuation of prisoners or other nearby residents. The intent of this safety zone is to provide a reasonable distance so that an emergency could be handled in a safe and orderly manner.

This legislation is prompted by a situation in my own district in which a proposed incinerator now under review is located less than one-half mile from the Allenwood Prison—which will soon house approximately 3,000 prisoners and employ 700 Federal prison officials. However, I understand that this same situation may be occurring in other parts of the country.

We have all heard or read about a number of hazardous waste accidents, including releases and spills. It took more than 2 days to evacuate a Miami prison after Hurricane Andrew. Without the proper precautions in place we could be endangering thousands of

lives. I urge adoption of this legislation as a way to prevent a catastrophe from occurring before rather than after the fact.

PASS THE RECONCILIATION BILL NOW

(Mr. RICHARDSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, in 2 days, we will vote on the President's reconciliation bill. Let me be clear—his plan is the plan. We must pass it in order to give our new President the same chance many of us gave President Reagan 12 years ago.

The President's plan is a fair, progressive and realistic approach to cutting the deficit and funding some very important and beneficial programs. Other plans have been floated in the other body by a so-called bipartisan group. That plan, and others like it, seek to accomplish one thing—to kill the President's plan. In so doing, they seek to protect the wealthy, to reintroduce bookkeeping smoke and mirrors by quietly shifting costs to others, and to limit the ability of Government to encourage job creation.

The President's plan will cut the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years. It includes a \$75 billion tax incentive for investment and jobs. It includes an increase in the earned income tax credit, a program that encourages the poor to work.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand with the President and his package, it moves us in the right direction and prescribes a valid cure to our economic problems.

□ 1220

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN MEANS A DEFICIT INCREASE, NOT DEFICIT REDUCTION

(Mr. SMITH of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, sometimes the only game in town is not a good game, so we should not play it.

Mr. Speaker, I think the American people are waking up to a lot of the political rhetoric that takes place here in Washington. A lot of the news media, a lot of individuals, call this a deficit reduction plan. No such thing. For the 5 years previous, from 1988 through 1992, the public debt increased an average of \$328 billion per year, mark that down, \$328 billion per year.

After raising taxes a record of \$332 billion over the next 5 years and having so-called deficit reduction, this reconciliation bill increases the public debt an average of \$360 billion per year for the next 5 years. It is not deficit re-

duction, it is increasing taxes and increasing spending. We are increasing the Federal debt from today's \$4.2 to \$6.2 trillion 5 years from now. Government overspending robs future generations of their chances for a strong economy.

The American people are waking up to what is important—let's hope the alarm clock goes off for Congress very soon.

RECONCILIATION BILL WOULD RESTORE FAIRNESS, CUT DEFICIT

(Mr. DERRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. Speaker, this week the American people will be focused on the House as we debate the jobs bill and reconciliation.

My constituents in South Carolina and the people in the rest of our country want the Congress and President Clinton to reduce the deficit, to cut Government spending and to pump life back into the economy.

The President's economic plan will produce huge spending cuts and it will inject fairness into the Tax Code.

First, the reconciliation bill slices \$496 billion from the deficit over the next 5 years.

Second, the bill freezes discretionary spending to the 1993 level in each of the next 5 years.

On the revenue side, the bill restores fairness to the tax system.

Seventy-five percent of its taxes will come from people earning \$100,000 or more annually. Under this bill, the wealthy will bear the highest tax burden.

Mr. Speaker, the reconciliation bill restores fairness and it cuts the deficit. Support President Clinton's plan.

CALIFORNIA EIGHTH GRADERS ACTIVE IN ISSUES-ORIENTED PROGRAM, WIN COMPETITION

(Mr. BAKER of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BAKER of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the students of Ann Hanks' eighth grade class at St. Raymonds Middle School in Dublin, CA, who won the American Youth Citizenship Competition in the 10th Congressional District.

The statewide program, sponsored by the Walt Disney Co., is an academic competition designed to inspire middle school students to take an active role in government by examining a current issue facing their community.

These young men and women worked diligently on a proposed antismoking ordinance which is one of the toughest issues facing most of our cities today.

As winners of the district competition, the St. Raymonds class will re-

ceive \$100 and will have its portfolio entered in the regional competition. The St. Raymonds portfolio will then compete against winning schools from six other congressional districts. The winning school at each of 10 regional competitions will receive \$250 and an expense-paid trip to Disneyland to compete in the State finals on June 2-4, 1993.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the students at St. Raymonds and wish them the best of luck in the regional competitions.

PRESIDENT CLINTON'S NAYSAYERS ARE WITHOUT A PLAN

(Mr. SCHUMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, we have a line here of naysayers, and they are all pointing holes in the President's plan. Anyone on this side of the aisle could do the same. Every one of us can point holes, but put up or shut up. Where is a plan that can pass?

A man from my party, the Senator from Oklahoma, came up with a plan. It is estimated it will get 20 votes in the Senate and 100 votes in the House. It is very easy to say no.

Mr. Speaker, we have spent 12 years saying no to everything as our country gradually slides down the drain. But the President, and we may disagree with specific parts, has had the courage to start putting this country in order and making us face the tough realities. We are going to try to do that here in the House as history is finally made.

Mr. Speaker, this morning the President told us at the White House he is going to fight for his plan. Go get 'em, Mr. President. Don't let parochial "what's in it for me" obstructionists fool the American people to protect energy producers. Your job is to do the right thing for the whole economy and the whole country. If you make that fight, an awful lot of people sick of gridlock will be at your side.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The Chair will remind Members that they should address the Chair, and not address the President directly.

A HAIL OF FAILURE

(Mr. HEFLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, the early days of the Clinton administration have been marked by failure. The American people are closely looking at his failed economic plan. Everywhere I

go people are saying, "Cut spending first," but Clinton fails to get it. He instead pursues failed old-time liberal spending policies. He is having trouble convincing his own party of the worth of his failing new tax program.

The people fail to sympathize with a failing President who fails to replace those failed taxes with spending cuts. Meanwhile, Bill Clinton is failing to keep his promises for middle-class tax relief. He is failing to stop illegal immigrants. He is failing to revive the economy. He is failing to keep his promise to cut White House staff, and failing to earn the people's confidence.

With all of this failure, what a shame it would be if the successes of the Clinton administration were built around new taxes, new spending, and more deficit. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help us this week to keep the President from failure in his new tax program, and vote against this tax program.

GIVE THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSALS A CHANCE TO SUCCEED

(Mr. REYNOLDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind the American people of what happened over the last 12 years. From 1980 until now our deficit went from \$60 billion a year to \$330 billion a year under the Republicans, not under Bill Clinton, under the Republican administration. Now they want us to make sure that the President fails this week.

This is about the failure of Bill Clinton. That is all this is about. My Republican colleagues are not debating this on the substance. They want to embarrass this President, the President that you voted for, the President that you sent to office, and the President that you support. Give him a chance. Just like the Democrats gave Ronald Reagan a chance, give Bill Clinton a chance.

NATIONAL MISSING CHILDREN'S DAY

(Mr. RAMSTAD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, today is National Missing Children's Day.

I will never forget a young boy from St. Joseph, MN, Jacob Wetterling, who was abducted 3½ years ago.

The Department of Justice reports there are over 114,000 such stranger abductions each year.

How can we tolerate this widespread, horrifying threat to our children?

Mr. Speaker, 22 States, including my own State of Minnesota, have enacted sex offender registration laws. These

laws are needed because these offenders repeat their crimes again and again. The typical child sex offender molests 117 children.

H.R. 324, the Jacob Wetterling bill, would create a national system of registration. This bill would require child sex offenders and abductors to register their addresses with police for 10 years after release from prison.

I urge all Members to join the 50 cosponsors from both sides of the aisle to pass a comprehensive crime bill which includes the Jacob Wetterling bill.

The children of America deserve nothing less.

EMPTY SLOGANS CANNOT DEFEAT A SERIOUS DEFICIT REDUCTION PLAN

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the reconciliation bill will pass. It will pass because it is a serious effort at deficit reduction, which we so badly need. The response, unfortunately, on the other side of the aisle has been slogans. I looked again at its proposals on the budget. It had within its \$119 billion in unspecified cuts, unspecified. It was an empty proposal.

It will also pass the House because we are not going to be hostage to the Senate. There is a bad mistake that the media, I am afraid, has not caught onto, and that is that no one person in the Senate can hold up the bill. If the Finance Committee in the Senate does not pass out a bill, the Senate Budget Committee under its rules can do so.

We in the House should do the right thing. I am confident in the end so will the Senate. The people will support a serious effort at deficit reduction, rather than the slogans that have been used to attack it.

□ 1240

WHITE HOUSE ACADEMY AWARDS NOMINEES

(Mr. WELDON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton's White House is off to a fast start in the race for next year's Academy Awards. A President so enamored of Hollywood has created a star-studded cast and crew right here in the Nation's Capital. The nominees are:

Best director: Harry Thomason for his own "Indecent Proposal"—an effort to can the travel office staff and have his own company take over the work instead.

Best actor: George Stephanopolous, who every day is forced to utter half-

truths, deceptions, and falsehoods all with a look of utmost sincerity.

Best choreographer: Dee Dee Myers, who dances around the truth at least twice a day.

Best actress: Catherine Cornelius, the President's 25-year-old cousin, who orchestrated the firing of the White House travel office and her own ascension to the top job.

Best supporting actor: William Kennedy, the White House counsel and Hillary's old law partner, who got the FBI to do the White House dirty work.

Best supporting actress: Janet Reno, who while not even realizing she was in a supporting role, was so out of the loop that she really made the lead players shine.

Best makeup: Christophe of Beverly Hills, the Presidential hair advisor, who charges \$200 per haircut, yet sticks the airlines with a \$76,000 bill.

Best new disaster movie: Hairport '93', a public relations fiasco for the White House.

Best song: "Don't stop thinking about tomorrow," Mr. President, because the first 5 months have been a disaster.

Best producers: Bill and Hillary, who so graciously allow these not-ready-for-prime-time performers to use the White House as their stage.

MILITARY BAN ON HOMOSEXUALS NOT A MATTER FOR COMPROMISE

(Mr. BUNNING asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, we have been hearing a lot recently about a magic, compromise solution for the controversy about the President's promise to lift the ban on homosexuals in the military.

This so-called, don't ask, don't listen, compromise reminds me of those three monkeys with their eyes, ears and mouths covered with their hands so that they will "hear no evil, see no evil, and speak no evil".

There is no way to compromise this particular issue, folks. Homosexuals should not be in the military because it is bad for morale and efficiency. Our military leaders are virtually unanimous on that point.

Forcing our military leaders to cover their eyes and ears and mouths is not going to make the problem go away and it definitely is not going to make it work.

The ban should stay in place. Homosexuals do not belong in the military.

When something is wrong, pretending it isn't there, doesn't make it right.

CLINTON HAIRCUT SYMBOLIZES EXTRAVAGANCE, LACK OF CONCERN

(Mr. GRAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. Speaker, for years, the symbol of Government waste has been \$700 hammers at the Pentagon. Well, now there is a new symbol: the Clinton haircut.

Now, it is one thing that the President spent \$200 of his own money on his hair. That may seem extravagant to most of us, but if that is the way he wants to spend his own money, that is his business.

What is more disturbing is that the Clinton haircut is estimated to have cost the airline industry \$76,000 in delayed flights. That is equal to the wages of three average working Americans.

While some dismissed the President's new "do" by saying he has "gone Hollywood," the more serious truth is that the Clinton haircut symbolizes the root problems of the Clinton economic policy.

First, it shows a passion for extravagant spending, the same kind of extravagance that sunk the President's stimulus bill.

Second, it shows that the President has little concern for the impact of his actions on the private sector. It is the same lack of concern we are seeing in the energy tax, striker replacement, and other job-killing measures.

And finally, it shows that the President has either no idea or no concern for what his policies will really cost. That is an alarming thought when you consider that the Clinton administration is about to engage in a hostile takeover of the insurance, student loan, and health care industries.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for the President to get off his throne, kick out the hairdressers, and get back in touch with reality. The American people cannot afford a government of \$76,000 haircuts.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION NEEDED TO SOLVE NEGOTIATED RATES CRISIS, FREE UP INVESTMENT CAPITAL

(Mr. SHUSTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago, both Houses of Congress spent a great deal of time and energy debating President Clinton's economic stimulus package. We talked about the need for such legislation, the timing of it and whether or not it would truly help the economy. As you well know, Republicans and Democrats did not agree on the answers to many of these questions.

However, there is an action that we can take which would free up \$32 billion in working capital where it would do the most good: in the checking accounts of hundreds of thousands of

American firms. That doubles the amount of the legislation we just debated.

That means that we do not have to wait for slow government stimulus programs to move through the economy; that is a process that can take months and often years. In the past, we have seen that Federal stimulus funds arrive too late, jolting the economy long after the need for adrenaline was gone.

Presently, companies of all sizes, in every region of the Nation, are setting aside money to pay for legal costs and possible claims from irresponsible law suits brought by bankrupt trucking companies. The trustees for these failed firms are suing hundreds of thousands of companies, trying to gouge money by using a legal loophole.

It is time that the Congress took action and solved the negotiated rates crisis once and for all. We cannot allow unscrupulous trustees, lawyers and collection agencies to continue their multibillion dollar racket when their actions are clearly against the national interest.

It is time for the Congress to act, both for the sake of American industry and our economy.

THE BEAT OF A DIFFERENT DRUMMER: THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

(Ms. DUNN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues across the aisle to march to the beat of a different drummer: the beat of the American taxpayer.

President Clinton is lobbying my Democratic colleagues to march with him to pass the largest tax increase in history.

But, Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle do not have to follow the President over the cliff. They don't have to be lemmings. They can see for themselves that more taxes are not what this country needs.

The political megaphone from the White House has increased in volume, but if you listen closely, you can hear the beat of the taxpayer's drums, and that beat is saying: Don't raise my taxes. Cut spending first, before you even whisper the word "taxes".

We can cut spending first, while not raising taxes. But first we need a rule that will allow amendments to strike the Btu tax and the Social Security tax. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against a closed rule that precludes these amendments, to march to the beat of a different drummer, the beat of the American taxpayer.

□ 1250

THINK CAREFULLY ABOUT RAISING TAXES

(Mr. WALSH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, later this week we will have a vote on the largest tax increase in our history. I urge my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to think about that vote very carefully.

Back in 1990 we were given the same reasons for supporting a huge tax increase that "Congress will commit to reduce spending if only we support the tax increase." Well, the taxes went up, and the deficit went up, and it keeps going up.

I do not know about your constituents, how they feel about more taxes, but my constituents, believe me, pay enough, and they are right. They already pay more taxes now at the local, State, and Federal levels than they have ever paid, and President Clinton wants the American taxpayer to pay more.

Think carefully about your vote this week on the rule and on reconciliation. History is a wonderful teacher. We need only go back 2 years to see what will happen if we pass this record increase. The economy will stay in the tank, the deficit will grow, and those who vote for the tax will be out looking for a new job.

IN HONOR OF FATHER AIDEN FOYNES

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Father Aiden Foynes, a man of tremendous dedication and love whose achievements will live on in the hearts of those who benefited from his counsel and his friendship for many years.

After 18 years as pastor of Our Lady of Queen of Peace Church in New Port Richey, FL, Father Foynes will be moving soon, bringing his talents and love to the congregation at St. Cecelia's in Clearwater. All of us who know Father Foynes thank him for his tremendous contribution to the growth of Our Lady of Queen of Peace and look forward to witnessing the power of his leadership at St. Cecelia's.

Mr. Speaker, the story of Father Foynes illustrates what one person with a fierce commitment can achieve in this world.

Born one of eight children to Michael and Ellen Foynes, in Butlersbridge, County Cavan, Ireland, Father Foynes was ordained on June 4, 1961. Immediately after ordination, he came to Florida at the request of Archbishop

Joseph P. Hurley and served as associate pastor at St. Cecelia's. From there, he was assigned to Cardinal Mooney High School in Sarasota from 1963-68, serving also at the Church of the Incarnation. In that period of his life, Father Foynes studied during summers and obtained his master of arts degree in religious education.

Serving as an associate pastor at Our Lady of Lourdes Church in Dundee from 1968-69, Father Foynes then moved on to become the pastor of Espiritu Santo Church in Safety Harbor and also served as principal-president of Clearwater Central Catholic High School until the summer of 1975, when he became pastor of Our Lady Queen of Peace.

Under Father Foynes' direction, major changes took place at the church, beginning with the building of the parish center, which opened in 1980. In 1988, Father Foynes dedicated the fine new priest's residence across the street from the church. A fitting tribute to Father Foynes and the membership of Our Lady Queen of Peace was that the residence was debt-free on its opening day.

Those achievements were followed up with a residence for Sisters bordering the north parking lot and a three-bay garage and workshop to accommodate maintenance equipment and to provide work space for the Rosary Alter Society.

But Father Foynes' biggest challenge and achievement was the planning and supervision of the expansion of the church itself. Father Foynes insisted on retaining as much of the old as possible, seeking to build on the proud history of the church. The original stained glass windows, made in 1920, were retained, serving as stations of the cross. The altar table, tabernacle and lectern, all carried over from the old church were clad in rich carrara marble to match the sanctuary which is now 11 feet longer than the old building was wide! All in all, the seating configuration was improved to achieve eye-to-eye contact between every parishioner and the celebrant and both the lighting and acoustics were vastly improved.

Mr. Speaker, if we only celebrated the building record of Father Foynes, we would be reciting achievements for a long time. But even more important about Father Foynes is the impact he has had on the lives of the people he has touched.

A dedicated priest for 25 years, Father Foynes is not really leaving Our Lady Queen of Peace, he is spreading his love for people and his commitment to the future just a little farther. And as we celebrate with the parishioners of Our Lady Queen of Peace the tremendous achievements of Father Foynes there, we anticipate anxiously the great deeds to come in his next phase of his dedication.

IT'S OBVIOUS, OR IS IT?

(Mr. GOSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the American people think the solution to our budget woes is obvious: Cut spending first. We spend more than we have, so we should be spending less. That is the way most American families approach their own budgets. Only in Washington could something so simple become so complex. In Washington we have important people telling us it is better to raise \$27 billion in new taxes from hard working American citizens than it is to cancel \$27 billion worth of services for illegal aliens. We are told it is better to raise more than \$18 billion from senior citizens than it is to make a modest, 3 percent cut in overhead costs for bloated Federal agencies; and they say it is better to raise another \$5.2 billion in taxes from middle America than it is to cut pork barrel highway demonstration projects. The list is endless. For every new dollar the President wants to raise from energy taxes and higher Social Security taxes, there is a dollar we could cut in wasteful or low-priority spending. Only in Washington does something so obvious become so confused, and so expensive for taxpayers.

U.N. CODDLING DICTATORS IN CHINA, MFN STATUS DEBATED IN UNITED STATES

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today Chinese human rights activist Shen Tong is holding a press conference in New York City to detail the Beijing regime's ongoing violations of human rights. In a shameful capitulation to the hardliners in Beijing, U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali barred Shen Tong from using the U.N. press club to brief reporters.

It is imperative that the world community take a strong stand against the kind of repression that is so rampant in China. The United States, as the leader of the free world, must make it clear that we will not employ a minimalist policy toward the Beijing regime. Such a policy would certainly be tantamount to coddling dictators.

Sadly, silent for months, the Clinton administration seems poised to announce such a minimalist policy with regard to China's most-favored-nation [MFN] trade status. The administration's consultation with Congress has been negligible on this vital human rights issue. If the President goes the route of a loophole-ridden Executive order, he will short circuit the opportunity for Congress to make it clear to the Beijing regime that substantive improvements in human rights are ab-

solutely necessary if China's preferential trade treatment is to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, much more is at stake here than another broken campaign promise. The women of China need to know that we will not turn a blind eye as they are forcibly aborted and sterilized. Religious believers must know that we will not stand by as they are beaten and killed for exercising their beliefs. China's brutal dictators also need to know that we will not tolerate the imprisonment, torture, and harassment of those who advocate democratic principles; nor will we tolerate the gross abuses inherent in Gulag labor, nor will we tolerate continuing violations of nuclear non-proliferation agreements.

Mr. President, I urge you to work with the Congress so that, together, we can send an unequivocal message to China's leaders that business as usual is not good enough anymore. Respect for fundamental human rights is a prerequisite for future favorable treatment from the United States.

ACT RESPONSIBLY TO REDUCE THE DEFICIT

(Mr. SANTORUM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, we are here this week to debate the Clinton tax package and the deficit-reduction package.

I wanted to make sure that all of us here kept our eye on the ball of what was really at stake, and that is the future of this country and the deficit that we are faced with.

A group of fifth-graders at Ben Franklin Elementary School in what used to be my district reminded me of that point yesterday when they presented to me a check for \$240.35, money they raised at a bake sale and a car wash to reduce the national debt. They expressed their concern about the Federal deficit and what it will do to their lives, to their future, to their opportunities for them and their children.

I hope that the message is now sent clear that we have to act responsibly here in this Congress and in this city to reduce this deficit.

ENVIRONMENTAL ILLNESS FROM DESERT STORM

(Mr. STEARNS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, we have a growing problem when our military forces that served in Desert Storm have been discharged or released from active duty with a standard medical clearance. This medical clearance precludes the possibility that some

undiagnosed disease which later becomes chronic or fatal can be classed as service connected. There is growing evidence of multichemical sensitivity in certain individuals that increases the risk of serious complications from exposure to chemicals and other environmental elements. Within my district, a young man, Michael Adcock, an outstanding high school athlete—football player and State recordholder in weightlifting—volunteered for duty in Operation Desert Storm. During his tour of duty, he was exposed to a chemical agent resistant coating which was the apparent cause of all of his subsequent medical problems. On April 23, 1992, Michael succumbed to cancer—11 months after his return from Desert Storm.

Mr. Speaker, we must find a way to better screen our young people for possible service-connected diseases—either at the time of discharge or in a continuing program of followup examinations after discharge.

INTRODUCTION OF THE BUDGET PROCESS REFORM ACT

(Mr. COX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, over the last 30 years this Congress has run up a public debt of over \$4 trillion, and now this week in our reconciliation bill we will pass so much new spending that we will add \$1.2 trillion to the national debt. That is what the Clinton plan calls for, despite the largest tax increase in American history.

This ever-increasing public debt is the inevitable result of a badly broken congressional budget process that virtually guarantees financial chaos. That is why the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY], and 125 of our colleagues have joined with me in introducing a bipartisan Budget Process Reform Act. The first tenet of this bill is that the budget itself should be a binding law, not the nonbinding concurrent resolution, that is virtually meaningless, that we presently use.

We end the practice of budget waivers, that notorious abuse under which in the last Congress over half of all spending bills waived the Budget Act in its entirety.

Every American who wants to restore fiscal sanity, who supports the principle that government should budget first and spend later, should support the Budget Process Reform Act.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will explain how the Budget Process Reform Act will control entitlement spending.

THE PRESIDENT'S PLAN CUTS SPENDING

(Mr. KOPETSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of rhetoric on the floor today about what the President's tax plan does and does not do.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for some facts. The fact is that there are over 200 specific spending cuts in the tax package that include about 300 billion dollars' worth of spending cuts. There is a hard freeze on discretionary spending in the budget for a 5-year period, and, yes, there are tax increases. Just as the President promised while he was campaigning, he is going to tax millionaires in this country, and those folks on the other side of the aisle are opposed to taxing millionaires to help reduce the deficit. They are also opposed to raising the corporate tax on the 2,700 largest businesses in America from the current rate of 34 percent to 35 percent to help reduce the deficit.

The President's plan is about deficit reduction. They do not talk about that. They do not talk about how high the deficit would be if we do not pass the President's plan.

If they vote against the President's plan, what they are doing is voting against deficit reduction. This is the vote to do it. They are going to have to explain why they are opposed to deficit reduction.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 1, NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH REVITALIZATION ACT OF 1993

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 179 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 179

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider the conference report to accompany the bill (S. 1) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes. All points of order against the conference report and against its consideration are waived.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The gentleman from New York [Ms. SLAUGHTER] is recognized for 1 hour.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes of debate time to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

House Resolution 179 is the rule providing for the consideration of S. 1, the conference report on the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993.

The rule waives all points of order against the conference report and against its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the conference report on S. 1, the bill for which the Rules Committee has recommended this rule, is an important and long-overdue authorization of the National Institutes of Health, particularly the National Cancer Institute, the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, and the National Institute of Aging.

Most importantly, the bill includes requirements to ensure that women and minorities are included in NIH-sponsored clinical research. To implement this policy of equity in health research, the conference report statutorily establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health. It begins to fill major gaps in women's health research through earmarks for research on breast and ovarian cancers and on osteoporosis.

S. 1 also statutorily authorizes the Office of AIDS Research to draw up and coordinate a comprehensive plan for AIDS research activities. Under the bill, the Office will direct how best to spend an emergency discretionary fund to focus efforts on the most promising AIDS research.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman DINGELL and Chairman WAXMAN for bringing back from conference this vital legislation that will safeguard the health of all Americans.

I ask my colleagues to support the rule so that we may deal with consideration of this important conference report.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time.

Mr. Speaker, the question was raised during the Committee on Rules' consideration of this rule as to why we are in such a rush to complete this legislation, the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993. We have just heard the gentleman from New York give us some of the important reasons and benefits that will flow from this legislation. And I think they have validity.

But I have to say that the rule did not really need to be granted just a few short hours after the lengthy conference report came back. There is a good deal in it, and it needed some opportunity to be considered, I think, more deliberatively than it was.

Nevertheless, we did ask that question exactly in the Rules Committee, "Why are we rushing this thing so?"

Frankly, the answer came back. It was very blunt, and it is a matter of record in the Rules Committee, and it is somewhat dismaying. The answer is, "We are doing this in such a hurry so that we will have something to talk about when we go home for the Memorial Day recess at the end of the week."

Well, I do not think that is a terrifically good explanation for rushing an important piece of legislation.

Taking this argument to its next logical step, I wonder if there may be some concern among the leadership

that perhaps the constituents are not going to be particularly too happy about the massive new tax increase that we are also going to be talking about this week and which we may in fact vote on later this week.

So, perhaps this is being regarded as the "good news" bill that we are going to take home to deflect attention and criticism of what is actually going on.

Once again, this House appears to be punching an artificial and very political timeclock, which has the effect of denying Members the greatest possible opportunity to review and consider legislation before they vote.

Again, I say there is much in this legislation which is very critical.

Mr. Speaker, the rule before us today was made necessary because of several technical considerations in this conference report. Such arcane and vague terms to the American public as "germaneness" and "scope" come into play here because this conference report contains a wide variety of measures, on a host of very different subjects, including some provisions that were the result of compromise between the House and the Senate. The Rules Committee was asked to issue a rule that waives points of order against this conference report—to ensure that the bill passes through the House without further delay. I certainly wish to commend those House conferees for negotiating very hard and prevailed on one issue that I think is of great importance, and that is an issue that is contained in this bill that deals with the question of HIV. This is a matter we had a lot of debate about, a lot of discussion, a lot of correspondence from my State, from many Americans across the Nation.

The conference report includes a provision to list HIV infection as a communicable disease. As my colleagues may very well remember, this was a topic of very great concern several months ago when the Clinton administration signaled its intent to lift the ban on HIV immigration to allow hundreds, potentially thousands of HIV-positive individuals to immigrate into the United States, which clearly would result in an incredibly difficult burden on an already strapped national health care system, not to mention an extraordinary cost involved which nobody has been able to calculate.

While I am grateful for the immigration language in the bill, I very much remain opposed to the effort to nullify the existing ban on using Federal funds for the controversial fetal tissue issue research question, using fetal tissue research from aborted babies seems to me to send a very mixed message about health care. I am very concerned that this change in policy will lead to more abortions. Whether it is intended or not, I am afraid that will be a consequence. I am afraid also that this provision will direct resources away

from other promising research programs. Alzheimer's has been mentioned often in this context.

To think that the only hope, the only answer for Alzheimer's victims, which is a terrible disease and one which we see the impact of, the tragedy of, the suffering of in my district quite often, to say that there is no other hope than fetal tissue research seems to me to be missing many opportunities and many bets that we hope the research medical community will be looking into and encourage them to.

□ 1310

There is also a significant concern about the changes this measure seeks to make in the way national AIDS research is conducted—this again is very topical these days—changes that are going to increase the bureaucracy and siphon desperately needed funds away from research and into red tape, and Lord knows there is nobody who wants more red tape and everybody wants more research on AIDS. I am afraid we have convoluted the process in this rule and in this bill in such a way that we now are going to have more red tape and less research.

The rule for this conference report is designed to make sure that the bill moves through this House as is, without getting tripped up by any technicalities. Even though I have got to point out that these technicalities were of such great concern that the members of the Rules Committee on the majority side when we first took this matter up, those technicalities were not to cause the majority vote in the Rules Committee not to allow us discussion on a number of amendments, not to make them in order for debate, even though now they come back to us after we have gone through the conferee process.

It is a less than perfect result we have got here today in this rule, and I am disappointed that the process could not be used to bring us to a better conclusion.

This Member, for one, will not be headed home next week to boast about what a wonderful thing we have done here in greasing the wheels to pass this bill. This Member will tell his constituents that Congress has again provided less than the best for this Nation.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule and of the bill.

Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we are not on the floor today with this important legislation in order to have something to talk about at home. We are on the floor today with this bill because it is a critical bill that helps people in every corner of our country.

As a conferee, I can attest to the hard work we have done on a biparti-

san basis with respect to this bill. For example, research into women's health care is now coming out of the dark ages and this legislation accelerates that progress.

This legislation also promotes biomedical research, particularly cancer research, research into the science of aging and into the problems of heart disease.

So Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to look at this bill carefully. It is not on the floor today in order to have something to talk about at home. It is on the floor today because this is a bill that will help people all across our country, and it is a bill that is needed not.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I have no other requests for time at this point, but before I yield back the balance of my time I would just like to respond to the gentleman from Oregon.

I was not making an observation about this question that has been raised about why we are rushing this bill. I was merely informing those interested in this rule in the process that we achieved it that when we asked the question in the Rule Committee about why we were rushing this bill through, the answer came back from those involved in the testimony process that perhaps it will give us something good to talk about when we go home, or words to that effect.

So this is not something that has been created by the minority side of the aisle as an obstacle or a deflection or hyperbole or excuse or anything else. This was a question that was asked in good faith as to why are we rushing into this, such an important piece of legislation and has so many implications for so many people, and that was the answer we got back.

Perhaps somebody might want to say it was facetious, but if the gentleman from Oregon is interested in pursuing it further, I would refer him to the records in the Rules Committee on this matter.

I do not believe even though we have talked about things as important as fetal tissue research and AIDS and how we are going to treat that and the immigration policy and how we deal with some of these health care issues that are so critically important for women, even though these things are in the bill, and I do not think this bill has had all the attention it needs, I am not going to call for a vote on this because I believe we should get on with the discussion of the bill.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered. The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the Senate bill (S. 1) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of the National Institutes of Health, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of May 20, 1993 page H 2620.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLILEY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on the conference report on S. 1, the Senate bill now under consideration.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that House and Senate conferees have resolved their differences on S. 1, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993. With one notable exception which I will comment upon shortly, the conference report reflects legislative initiatives in which the House can take great pride.

Passage of the conference report today represents a major advance in maintaining America's leadership and international preeminence in biomedical research. The conference agreement is a comprehensive measure which addresses policy, financial and organizational issues of growing concern to the public and scientific community.

I am pleased to report that the conference agreement enjoys the strong support of President Bill Clinton and Health and Human Services Secretary Donna Shalala.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement codifies President's Clinton's decision to lift the Bush administration's ban on fetal tissue transplantation research. Until President Clinton issued his Executive order, the ban had stopped promising research on the treatment of Parkinson's disease, juvenile diabetes, spinal cord injuries, and Alzheimer's disease. It had also stopped research on techniques to correct genetic defects—defects for which there

is now no cure or treatment—even before a baby is born.

S. 1 strikes down this ban and establishes strong safeguards for the conduct of this research to protect against potential abuse. I am pleased to report that Secretary Shalala has assured the committee of the administration's commitment to fully explore the enormous scientific potential that fetal tissue research represents. I submit a copy of the Secretary's letter on this subject to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH
AND HUMAN SERVICES,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1993.

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN,
Chairman, Energy and Commerce Subcommittee
on Health and the Environment, House of
Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: During final consideration of the reauthorization bill for the National Institutes of Health a question was raised about our plans to fund human fetal tissue transplantation research. The purpose of this letter is to share with you the Department's commitment to this important field of inquiry.

As you know, on January 22, 1993, President Clinton issued a directive ending the five-year moratorium on Federal funding for therapeutic transplantation research that uses human fetal tissue derived from induced abortion. The lifting of the moratorium means that Federal funding of this research is now possible and that the decisions of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) regarding funding will be based on scientific merit and the relevance of the research proposals to the advancement of the health missions of the NIH.

Following the lifting of the moratorium, I asked the Acting Assistant Secretary for Health, Dr. Audrey Manley, to request that NIH develop interim guidelines based on the recommendations of the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel. NIH was further asked to develop a proposed plan for the advancement of this research.

NIH has published the interim guidelines for use by the scientific community. In addition, NIH has prepared plans for therapeutic fetal tissue transplantation research and has already received a number of research applications that are undergoing scientific review. Fetal tissue transplantation research is an important line of inquiry in the advancement of the mission of a number of Institutes, Centers, and Divisions of the NIH and the NIH's plans reflect the value of both clinical and non-clinical fetal tissue transplantation research.

I assure you that human fetal tissue transplantation research is a high priority of the Department of Health and Human Services and that we intend to fund scientifically meritorious research efforts beginning in late fiscal year 1993 or fiscal year 1994.

Identical letters are being sent to Congressman Dingell and Senator Kennedy.

Sincerely,

DONNA E. SHALALA.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of the most significant achievements of this conference agreement are the provisions directed at improving women's health. In the past, NIH has not done an adequate job of assuring the inclusion of women as research subjects in clinical trials. In the past, treatment

recommendations have been made for women but based upon studies that involved only men. The conference agreement remedies this deficiency in several ways.

First, the agreement establishes an Office of Research on Women's Health. The Office is charged with the development of a research plan to promote investigations of diseases that afflict women. Second, the agreement requires that women and members of racial and ethnic minority groups are appropriately included in NIH-funded clinical trials. Such requirements will assure that the findings of future clinical trials will have general applicability to the American population. Third, the legislation contains a special, increased supplemental authorization of appropriations for research on breast cancer and on ovarian cancer—two of the leading causes of illness and death among women. Fourth, the agreement establishes a program of research centers to develop improved methods of contraception and to discover better means of treating infertility. Finally, the agreement authorizes a special supplemental research initiative to boost funding for investigations of osteoporosis, a problem of great significance to older women.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement also extends for 3 fiscal years the authorization of appropriations for high priority NIH research programs. These authorizations include the National Cancer Institute; National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute; National Institute on Aging; National Library of Medicine; and National Research Service Awards.

By providing a new authorization of appropriations to strengthen the important programs of the National Institute on Aging, the conference agreement reaffirms the recommendations of the Pepper Commission for an increased commitment by the Federal Government to aging research.

Mr. Speaker, I want to note that the legislation singles out the National Cancer Institute for additional support by endorsing, for the first time, the Institute's proposed by-pass budget. Under the conference agreement, the authorization of appropriations for cancer research will be increased from its current appropriation level of \$1.9 billion in fiscal year 1993, to an authorized funding level of \$3.2 billion in fiscal year 1994. I am also pleased to report that the conference agreement provides for a major expansion in the National Cancer Institute's cancer control budget. Over the next 3 fiscal years, the agreement requires that the percentage of funds allocated to cancer control activities double. The conferees believe cancer control programs hold great promise for reducing the incidence and morbidity of cancer.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement strengthens NIH procedures for

dealing with scientific misconduct, protecting whistleblowers, and preventing conflicts of interest. The distinguished chairman of the full committee, Mr. DINGELL, and the staff of his Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations are to be commended for their work in the development of these important safeguards.

The conference agreement also contains a number of provisions designed to improve morale at the NIH and to aid in the recruitment of talented researchers to Federal service. First, the legislation will help NIH retain talented senior scientists by implementing the Senior Biomedical Research Service [SBRS] and raising the number of SBRS personnel from 350 to 500. In recognition of the late Silvio Conte's role in the SBRS's establishment, the service is renamed the Silvio O. Conte Senior Biomedical Research Service. For several years, the Office of Management and Budget has blocked implementation of this innovative scientific personnel system. With passage of this legislation, we are hopeful further obstacles will be removed and immediate steps taken to begin recruitment into this innovative scientific personnel system.

The conference agreement also provides the NIH and the Food and Drug Administration with special authorities to offer prospective physicians and scientists incentive packages that include loan repayments of up to \$20,000 per year in exchange for a 3-year commitment to work at NIH or the FDA. Additional loan repayment authority is also provided to encourage the training of scientific investigators in the field of AIDS, contraception, and infertility research.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement retains authorities to spur research into chronic fatigue syndrome, sleep disorders, juvenile arthritis, multiple sclerosis and child health, including development of more effective childhood vaccines. In addition, a special \$150 million funding authority is provided for construction projects to modernize and rehabilitate the infrastructure of our Nation's biomedical research laboratories.

Mr. Speaker, the conference agreement includes a number of studies contained in the original Senate bill. I am particularly pleased to note the inclusion of a study to further elaborate on the relationship between the abuse of licit and illicit drugs by young people. The report represents an important opportunity for the Secretary of Health and Human Services to further expand public understanding of the impact on illicit drug use posed by the use of tobacco and alcohol by adolescents. This report should include the most up-to-date information on the comparative health, social and economic costs of substance abuse on our Nation with particular focus upon those legal drugs,

including alcohol and tobacco, which are subject to State or Federal regulation.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to note that the agreement contains a series of suggested Senate modifications to the Health Professions Student Loan [HPSL] Program and provides a new \$10 million authorization of appropriations for additional Federal capital contributions. Funds available under this new funding authority are limited to those medical schools which have the best record of training medical students to enter primary care careers.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to go on record as opposing the provisions in this conference report regarding immigration of people with HIV. If the Rules of the House had allowed me to sign separately on this issue, I would not have signed these provisions. I fully recognize that the conferees who signed this provision do not intend to change current travel and immigration policy and that they do not intend to start testing programs that don't now exist or to start exclusions that are not now taking place. I fully appreciate that waivers are available and that the Attorney General has exercised a great deal of discretion in allowing travelers, refugees, immigrants, and others into the United States. But I object to the current policy and I object to the codification of it.

These provisions do not treat people with HIV in a fair manner. If it were a question of costs, the public charge provisions could have been used. If it were a question of public health, the public health provisions could have been used.

It was neither of these. It was a question of discrimination. The conferees in this instance have overruled every public health expert who has reviewed this provision. The conferees have overruled a Republican and a Democratic Secretary of Health. The conferees have chosen to ignore all evidence and reason and to capitulate to phobias instead.

But I have agreed to this conference report anyway for two reasons: First, this bill contains many good and important provisions regarding AIDS, women's health, and biomedical research. And second, if this bill were killed over the immigration amendments, these amendments would simply spring up on the next Senate bill that comes along. The votes in the other body were clear, and with no germaneness rules to limit them, the other body will certainly try to attach these immigration provisions to every piece of worthy legislation. The immigration amendments are, I'm afraid, inevitable, and so I am unwilling to kill a health research bill that contains so much for so many.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support for the conference report.

□ 1320

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my opposition to the conference report on S. 1. I take this action regretfully, but I feel that the bill will ultimately damage the work of the National Institutes of Health [NIH] and I am unable to support it.

The National Institutes of Health is one of the finest research institutions in the world and merits our strong support. I am concerned that enactment of the legislation we are debating today will impede, and not enhance, the very fine work that is conducted by NIH. In reauthorizing NIH, we need to emphasize sound science and that NIH must be above both politics and political correctness.

While I can well understand the need for a certain amount of congressional direction and I am certainly supportive of congressional oversight, the conference report before us goes way beyond that. It contains numerous set-asides, research centers and research mandates for specific diseases. For example, the conference report creates at least 13 new offices, centers, or committees and mandates at least 13 studies in title 19. It directs the Secretary to conduct research on behavioral and social sciences, osteoporosis, Paget's disease, breast and ovarian cancer, prostate cancer, obesity, juvenile arthritis, chronic fatigue syndrome, and contraception and infertility. I personally doubt that a world-renowned institution such as the NIH really needs this much detailed congressional direction in order to conduct the best possible scientific research.

Another matter of very serious concern to me is the conference report's nullification of the moratorium on fetal research. I cannot, in good conscience, support the decision to allow such research to move forward with Federal funds. I firmly believe that opening up the door to such research will only lead to more abortions. I also believe that, over time, the safeguards against allowing such research to become an inducement for abortion will prove to be meaningless.

Finally, I would like to note my very serious concerns regarding provisions of the bill that would restructure the funding of AIDS research projects. Section 2353 will totally transform how AIDS research is funded at NIH. Under this provision, appropriations for AIDS research will not go directly to the various institutes as is the current practice, but will go directly to the Director of the Office on AIDS Research.

In a letter dated January 22, 1993, to the NIH Director, Bernadine Healy, the 22 Institute and Center Directors of NIH, said the following:

The bill * * * as written, creates an administrative structure and outline of authorities

which, in fact, may inadvertently be detrimental to the main purpose to which the legislation was directed * * * it, in fact, will have the opposite effect of impeding both the planning process and particularly the execution of AIDS research because of the additional bureaucratic layer which will have been added to the process. Of major concern is the paradox that this, in fact, will have the effect of impeding the progress of AIDS research and, at the same time, having negative effects on non-AIDS research. By hurting research other than AIDS, there will also be the additive effect of hampering those multidisciplinary areas of research that feed into AIDS research, thus compounding the problem.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons, I am strongly opposed to this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. McDERMOTT].

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, while I support the efforts of my colleagues responsible for bringing the conference report on the National Institutes of Health reauthorization to the floor, I must speak against the provision codifying the ban on immigration and travel of foreign nationals with HIV and AIDS.

This provision is severely damaging to this country's efforts, and indeed the world's efforts, to prevent discrimination against the estimated 14 million men, women, and children infected with HIV in the world today.

One million of those HIV-infections are in the United States. Closing our borders will not prevent the continued spread of this disease in this country. Only a strategic policy of education, prevention, and care will accomplish this.

Nor will this immigration ban further research efforts and information gathering which take place at international conferences—activities which are very important in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

Sending an international message of discrimination shows how very far this Nation must go in avoiding the myths and facing the facts about AIDS.

A ban on immigration and travel on people with HIV and AIDS cannot protect us from the spread of this virus, will not save us from its profound costs, and will never allow us to deal openly with this epidemic.

This conference report contains many positive steps forward in HIV/AIDS research and prevention, which I wholeheartedly support, but it is my view that the provision codifying the ban on immigration sets us back immeasurably in the struggle to end discrimination against people with HIV and AIDS.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is my great pleasure to yield 3½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. ROUKEMA].

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on S. 1, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act. While there are many reasons to support this conference report, I would call attention to one of the most important provisions in the bill, that relating to the immigration of AIDS-infected aliens.

I am pleased to see that the conferees have taken note of the strong and clear position of the House on this issue, and have included language codifying the ban on the permanent immigration of HIV-infected individuals. This language is identical to the provisions of H.R. 985, the McCollum-Roukema-Solomon-Smith bill, and statutorily designates AIDS, and HIV-infection, as a communicable disease of public health significance.

As my colleagues may recall, support for this measure is overwhelming—similar provisions were adopted by a 3-to-1 margin in the other body, and in the House, more than 350 Members voted to maintain this ban.

I wish that this statutory designation was not necessary. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, earlier this year President Clinton proposed removing AIDS from the list of diseases for which immigration into this country can be denied. That policy cannot be supported by medical or scientific evidence. I had hoped that in the face of these facts, the President would have withdrawn his proposal. But, to date, he has not.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues that we cannot afford media distortions. The simple fact is—AIDS must be treated as an issue of public health, not one of civil rights or political expediency. And as an issue of public health, the ban on permanent immigration must be maintained.

We know the facts: AIDS remains terminal and contagious in nature. No cure has been found. Every piece of medical information indicates that the epidemic is accelerating. Just last week, the World Health Organization—the definitive medical expert on the AIDS epidemic—raised its estimate from 13 to 14 million persons infected with HIV. At this rate, WHO estimates that 30 to 40 million people will be infected by the year 2000.

Finally, scientists are finding new strains of HIV and pneumonia, proving the point that there is more unknown than known about this disease.

There are also enormous costs associated with this disease. The long-term costs of treating an AIDS patient start at \$100,000 each. We are here on the floor increasing the money we spend on AIDS research and treatment, and still our public hospitals cannot face the existing case load.

And more and more, it is the public—the taxpaying American citizen—who picks up the cost of care for AIDS pa-

tients. How, in the name of all that is rational, can we act to radically increase those costs? At a time when millions of Americans struggle daily under the crushing burden of escalating health care costs, how can we knowingly add to that drain?

Let me remind my colleagues that never in the history of modern medicine have we knowingly admitted new sources of contagion during an epidemic. Our efforts should be concentrated on containing the spread of the epidemic, not introducing new sources of infection. Lifting the ban on AIDS would only serve to place healthy citizens at higher risk, and the conference committee has done well to reject this ill-conceived plan.

Finally, let me note for the record that this is not a heartless or cruel policy. Our present law can and does deal with visitors infected with HIV. We allow waivers for men and women who may want to visit family, seek medical treatment, or conduct business. These people are allowed to enter the United States for a short time, and the McCollum-Roukema-Solomon-Smith provision in no way alters those waivers.

The conference report before us ensures that AIDS shall be classified as a communicable disease of public health significance, and that the long-standing prohibition on HIV-infected immigration stays in place. I am pleased to see that the conference report has rejected specious arguments based on political considerations, and has brought back to us the only acceptable policy supported by medical and scientific evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleagues on the conference committee for their fine work, and urge each of my colleagues to support the conference report.

□ 1330

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Mrs. UNSOELD].

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time, and would congratulate him on a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, it has been almost 3 years since the General Accounting Office reported that medical research was done mainly by men on men for men—3 years of educating and advocating and fighting for equal attention to women's health. I am very happy to be standing here today expressing my support for final passage of the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act.

The NIH Act means more than increased funding for areas such as breast cancer, osteoporosis, contraception, and infertility. It means more than increased numbers of women conducting medical research or participating in clinical trials. It means that our Nation will no longer think of women's health concerns as an afterthought,

but as a vital part of our Nation's health research agenda.

I urge my colleagues to support this landmark legislation to improve the health and the lives of our Nation's women for generations to come.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, tragically for the children who will be abused as a result of this bill, the legislation before us codifies the reversal of the moratorium on the use of deliberately aborted babies in federally funded research.

The legislation neglects to include important safeguards recommended by the 1988 Human Fetal Tissue Transplantation Research Panel, thereby allowing for an extreme reversal of Federal policy and flagrant disregard for innocent human life. The legislation creates ethic advisory boards and entrusts these boards with the authority to determine the appropriateness of specific life threatening and life taking experiments involving unborn babies. It is a remarkable power these boards will hold, differentiating the acceptability of one horrendous human dissection from another.

If the past is prolog, Mr. Speaker, it is conceivable that experiments and transplantation from living unborn babies will be the next target of federally sanctioned research. According to the Energy and Commerce report of H.R. 5661, the bill of 1990, in 1974 Federal-funded researchers saw fit to conduct experiments on living unborn babies. The report details the experiment, which the gentleman from California [Mr. WAXMAN] and others point to with high esteem, and which I think is unfortunate, which involved the administration of the rubella vaccine to pregnant women in the following manner. "Because of the potential risk to the fetus, women requesting therapeutic abortion were employed as subjects. These volunteers received the vaccine and underwent the abortion 11 to 30 days later. Examination of tissues from the dead aborted fetuses showed that in contrast to the results in monkeys, the vaccine virus did cross the human placenta and infect the fetus."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, these living unborn children were used as guinea pigs, deliberately exposed to the rubella vaccine, deliberately exposed to this disease while they were still alive, again being used as guinea pigs, and then killed by the abortionist, and then their bodies were dissected to see what happened.

What happens if some of those women decided not to abort and these children were affected in a negative way by the disease? What would have happened? We would have had deliberately induced deformity in a child. This brave new world of research re-

gards unborn babies as guinea pigs, and treats them inhumanly.

Let me remind Members that this experiment occurred under the same scenario, Mr. Speaker, that S. 1 is establishing. No safeguards are included in the bill to prevent this type of so-called research from occurring.

Mr. Speaker, if you want to get a clear picture of what transplantation looks like, and this I believe will become much more rampant as a result of this bill, here is a verbatim description of fetal tissue extractions reported in the June 1989 issue of the Archives of Neurology. "Two methods of collect fetal material were used. With the first method, a plastic cannula, connected to a 60 ml syringe, was inserted into the uterus. Under ultrasound guidance, the opening of the cannula was directed to the fetal head. Suction was applied, and the fetus was slowly aspirated and fragmented into the cannula."

S. 1 establishes a close relationship between abortionists and medical researchers. This collaboration of medical researchers lends credence to the practice and further dehumanizes human life. It cheapens the lives of unborn children.

It seems to me ironic, Mr. Speaker, that the policies put forth in S. 1 place such a high premium on the value of fetal tissue and individual parts of unborn babies, yet we will not acknowledge the inherent value of that same life as a whole for himself or herself.

By voting in favor of S. 1, we are giving our seal of approval to this barbaric research. I hope Members will reconsider.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to comment that after hearing the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] who just addressed us, it seems to me the most barbaric thing would be to have women who are pregnant have rubella vaccines without knowing that their babies would be deformed. I also want to point out that while I disagree with the gentleman on that issue, that is not what is before us today. That kind of research is not affected by what we have in this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report. We have waited 3 long years for this bill to finally reach the floor with an assurance that it will be signed into law. This bill contains critical provisions to address the historic neglect of women's health research. The Congressional Caucus for women's issues has been working to fill the gaps in research on women's health since 1989, when we requested a GAO study on the status of women's health research; the resulting report in 1990 led to many of the provi-

sions that are included in this legislation today.

Among its many important provisions are the requirement that women and minorities be represented in clinical trials and the permanent authorization of the Office of Research on Women's Health at NIH. Funding for breast and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, and other women's diseases is increased, and legislation to establish a National Cancer Registry is also part of the conference report.

I note that the conference report authorizes a new Office of AIDS Research within NIH. I look forward to working with that office. Hopefully the increased research on HIV in women will be part of what the office's commitment will be.

The bill also lifts the ban on fetal tissue research, which has already led to a number of medical advances and is very promising in fighting diseases ranging from Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease to Juvenile diabetes and leukemia. The bill provides strict safeguards for the donation of fetal tissue and is supported by a broad coalition of scientific and health organization, including the American Medical Association, the American Academy of Pediatrics, and the American College of Physicians, to name just a few.

Mr. Speaker, women's health concerns have lagged behind for generations, and it is vitally important that the needs of millions of women across the country are finally addressed. This legislation will go a long way toward bridging this gap, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON].

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, not a day goes by when we are not reminded of someone less fortunate. Any of us that read yesterday's Washington Post could not miss the tragic front-page story of Doti Lonaberger and Frank Aldrich, who suffer from Freiderich's ataxia. Many of us have watched closely as a friend, colleague, or family member has suffered a long, often painful, disease that has robbed them of their life. We have all sat by that bedside, as we have gripped their hand, prayed, and often wondered out loud, why?

Why is it that we have not found a cure for something that strikes one in nine women, like breast cancer? Why can we not help prevent the suffering of our next-door neighbor who has Lou Gehrig's disease, the child down the street with leukemia, our former colleague Mo Udall with Parkinson's, our parents with Alzheimer's, the list goes on and on and on. No family has been untouched.

How tragic that our Nation, with the best and brightest physicians and researchers, armed with an awesome arsenal of health care technology, have

not been able to fully utilize the tools of science to combat these painful, dreadful killer diseases until now.

Mr. Speaker, a year and a half ago I doubt that many Members here knew much about fetal tissue research. Virtually everyone in the research community supported the research, but there was opposition, by a minority here in Congress.

Now, that is gridlock. This, despite the fact that a Reagan-appointed panel voted overwhelmingly to continue the research, saying that it would not lead to more abortions.

In fact, in perhaps a rare event of prochoice and prolife harmony, the safeguards for fetal tissue research were strengthened with my amendment.

Most of us here have benefited from this research, which relieved us from crippling diseases of an earlier era, such as polio, which today exists only as a wrenching memory.

Almost every day we hear about new breakthroughs in medical science. We have wasted a year by not enacting the bill, this bill, last year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is more than hope. It is life for so many.

Have my colleagues met Joan Samuelson, who despite having Parkinson's still is able to move down the Halls of Congress hoping to win the race for a cure? Have they met Baptist minister Guy Walden, whose child lives today because of this research, after losing two others to an awful, early death?

As I put my two little kids to bed last night and began to think about my speech today, I thought about my answer when they someday will ask of their dad, "What did you do in Congress to make a difference?"

The enactment of this bill will say it all. Mr. Speaker, life will always be too short, but let us do what we can to save lives.

Please vote "yes." We cannot wait another day.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Virginia [Ms. BYRNE].

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for the NIH conference report. It has taken us a long time to reach this point, and we must be thankful for a President in the White House who recognizes the need for more research into the many health concerns of women. All of the provisions of this bill are important; all of them are overdue.

Mr. Speaker, breast cancer is the leading cause of death in women between the ages of 35 and 54. Every 3 minutes a woman in America is diagnosed with breast cancer. Every 11 minutes someone's mother, sister, daughter, or wife dies of breast cancer. Those are 46,000 needless deaths.

This legislation authorizes \$225 million for basic breast cancer research, and \$100 million for detection, preven-

tion, and treatment. It authorizes \$75 million for gynecological research as well.

We also cannot overlook the fact that AIDS is spreading exponentially among women—faster and farther than among any other group. Last year it was the fifth leading cause of death among all women in this country. This legislation creates a \$100 million discretionary fund for AIDS research.

The AIDS epidemic also points to a dire need for contraceptive research. Mr. Speaker, we can do so much more to protect our youth from this deadly and costly disease. This bill is a major step in that direction.

It authorizes \$30 million in fiscal year 1994 to fund five applied research centers under the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Three of the centers will focus on better methods of contraception. Two centers will be devoted to new treatments for infertility.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to lend this important legislation their strongest and most enthusiastic support.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, although there is much good in this conference report, I will vote against it because it allows federally supported research using fetal tissue transplants from elective abortions.

On the positive side, it does, believe it or not, include language that codifies the ban on permanent entry of HIV-infected immigrants. This ban was supported by a vast majority of the American people, and I am happy to see that it was included in the conference report.

It also creates a new Office of AIDS Research for Centralized Planning and Coordination. While I support this, because of the increasing number of AIDS deaths, I find it peculiar that NIH does not have an Office of Heart Disease Research, which last year killed 750,000 of our fellow citizens. The tragedy of AIDS is still mercifully between 20,000 and 25,000.

While S. 1 supporters claim it will guard against abuses in fetal tissue research by prohibiting the sale of fetal tissue, do not believe for a second that that is going to be firm law. It will be violated regularly, as it has been for decades, with aborted babies sold to medical labs after they are dead.

S. 1 supporters also claim it will prevent the directed donation of tissues. I recently saw a television show glorify a family in which the woman, in her forties, deliberately conceives in order to have a baby girl so that the baby's bone marrow could be transplanted into her older sister thus saving her life. That was excellent and heroic, but not really the best reason to have a child. With all of this glorification, can

anyone tell me we are not going to see stories about a misguided daughter who, to save her father with Parkinson's gets pregnant and then terminates that pregnancy to extend her father's life into his 80's or 90's?

S. 1 also says that any interference with abortion procedures for purposes of obtaining fetal tissue will not be allowed.

Does anyone believe for a minute, when abortionists, those who do nothing else—I do not even consider it medicine—are already describing to one another the D&X procedure, where you bring the preborn child into the birth canal, insert scissors at the base of the skull, open up a hole, and then put in a tube and evacuate the brain tissue. By the way, we are being told, especially from Frankenstein experiments in Stockholm, Sweden, that this brain tissue is the way to extend people's lives into their 80's and 90's. They take the brain tissue from a child in the womb and put it directly into the head of someone who has one of these debilitating diseases generally associated with old age. Does anyone think for a minute that this language is going to be respected?

People will violate these provisions for the purpose of obtaining fetal tissue.

□ 1350

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD], the ranking member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the National Institutes of Health is one of the most prestigious research facilities in the world and I support reauthorization of those programs which have expired. However, I have several concerns about numerous provisions in the conference report on S. 1.

Let me briefly mention a few of those concerns.

Last year, President Bush established a fetal tissue bank. We received several letters from noted scientists, including Dr. Bernadine Healy, Director of the NIH, stating that the tissue bank was a viable alternative to using tissue from aborted fetuses to meet research needs. Why has the moratorium been lifted before we know if the tissue bank is or is not a success? I cannot support legislation which would permit the use of tissue from induced abortions for this research.

I am also concerned about the level of funding in the conference report. When the President is proposing raising taxes to help reduce the Federal deficit, it is critical that we not respond with business as usual; namely increased spending. The American people do not want to see their taxes in-

creased only to see Federal spending increase. I urge my colleagues to dispel fiscal constraint.

I am also very concerned about the provisions of the conference report which would significantly alter the mechanism by which AIDS research is funded. I think it is dangerous to put all the authority over AIDS research funding into the hands of one individual. I am afraid that both AIDS and non-AIDS research will suffer.

Mr. Speaker, for all these reasons—because I am a strong supporter of NIH, I cannot support the conference report. I urge my colleagues to reject it.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note in conclusion that NIH has not been authorized for several years, but the programs have been going forward and the programs have been prospering. This report with these provisions are not necessary for the success of NIH.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I was a conferee on section 2007 of this bill dealing with an amendment to the Immigration and Nationality Act. I wanted to take a moment to explain a successful conclusion to that, even though I must say that I oppose much of this bill.

The part that I dealt with, though, in the conference from the Committee on the Judiciary deals with the exclusion of aliens who have the HIV virus. As agreed to in the conference, the bill incorporates the language of the McCollum-Solomon-Roukema-Smith bill on HIV exclusion, which was H.R. 985, and which 82 other Members have cosponsored.

Under section 212(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, certain noncitizens or aliens are excluded from the United States because of health-related conditions. One of the primary health-related grounds of exclusion is an infection with a communicable disease of public health significance.

As the Members are probably aware, the Clinton administration indicated early on this year that they were going to no longer recognize HIV under this category, and the Senate passed as an amendment to this bill a provision that Senator NICKLES offered that would have placed the HIV clearly as a communicable disease, and did a number of other things involving the requirement of certain testing that would have to take place, and certain waivers that would be locked in by statute.

The ultimate result of the conference, which is the product that is out here today, was not to adopt the Nickles provisions per se, but rather to go back to what some of us offered originally in bill form, but on which we

had never voted on the floor, but which codifies clearly that the HIV or AIDS virus clearly is a communicable disease of public health significance, and that somebody is subject to exclusion under it; in other words, to codify the present law as it is today without all of the trimmings that the Nickles amendment might have done to it.

I think it is a solid provision. I think it does the right thing. It does what the majority of Members of both parties really want to do, and with respect to that, I think this bill is in good shape. However, as I said earlier, I have other problems with the bill unrelated to that.

I thought Members should know that the HIV issue in this bill has been squared away, is straightened out, is acceptable to the minority, and I think to most of the majority as well. I thank the gentleman for yielding for that explanation.

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to note in conclusion that NIH has not been authorized for several years, but the programs have been going forward and the programs have been prospering. This report with these provisions are not necessary for the success of NIH.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MCCOLLUM].

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, section 2007 of the conference report before the House amends the Immigration and Nationality Act. This provision is not related to the remainder of the bill, on which I was not a conferee and much of which I oppose.

However, section 2007 is a significant provision on which both this House and the other chamber expressed overwhelmingly strong views. As a conferee on that section alone, I would like to explain its terms and implications.

Section 2007 codifies the current regulatory exclusion of aliens who are HIV positive. As agreed to in conference, the bill incorporates the language of the McCollum-Solomon-Roukema-Smith bill on HIV exclusion, H.R. 985, which 82 other Members have cosponsored.

Under section 212(a)(1)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, certain non-citizens—or aliens—are excluded from the United States because of health-related conditions. One of the primary health-related grounds of exclusion is infection with a communicable disease of public health significance.

Specific diseases are not listed in the statute; the Secretary of Health and Human Services is to determine which diseases meet this standard and list them in regulations.

In 1987, Congress adopted language directing HHS to add HIV to the list of excludable diseases, which the statute then described as "any dangerous contagious disease." At the same time, HHS was moving to do just that.

The Immigration Act of 1990 rewrote the standard for excludable diseases to read communicable disease of public health significance.

In 1991, HHS proposed a new rule removing HIV from the list of excludable diseases. In

the face of strong opposition from Congress and the Justice Department, HHS issued an interim rule that retained HIV on the list.

In 1993, HHS has again submitted a final rule removing HIV from the list, and the Clinton Administration stated in February that HIV would be removed from the list.

Congress has responded by stating clearly and overwhelmingly its view that HIV is a communicable disease of public health significance, and that aliens infected with this disease should be excluded.

On February 18, the Senate voted 76 to 23 to adopt the Nickles amendment to S. 1. On the same day, H.R. 985 was introduced with 64 cosponsors. On March 11, the House voted 356 to 58 to instruct House conferees on S. 1 to accept the Nickles amendment.

The Nickles amendment specified that HIV is a communicable disease of public health significance under the INA, required a report with several specific types of data, and mandated testing for HIV in accordance with the policy in effect on January 1, 1993. It also codified current administrative waivers of the testing requirement for nonimmigrants seeking entry for 30 days or less for specific purposes including tourism.

After rejecting proposals that would have severely weakened codification of the current HIV exclusion, House conferees on the NIH reauthorization bill offered the McCollum-Solomon-Roukema-Smith language as an alternative to the Nickles amendment.

Senate conferees initially opposed this offer, rejecting language—which was included in both the House language and the Nickles amendment—calling HIV a "communicable disease of public health significance." After further negotiation, the Senate accepted the House offer.

The final result is that S. 1 codifies current regulations listing HIV as a "communicable disease of public health significance." Waiver authority under current law remains unchanged. The current statutory requirement that immigrants and refugees be given medical exams also remains unchanged.

Under current waiver authority, a waiver may be granted to applicants for immigrant visas if they are close relatives of a U.S. citizen or permanent resident alien. Refugees may also be granted a waiver.

Although applicants for nonimmigrant visas are not required to undergo medical exams, there are cases where a consular or immigration officer knows, or has reason to know, that an applicant is HIV positive and requires the applicant to submit to a medical exam. If the applicant tests positive, he or she is excludable.

Current law allows the Attorney General the discretion to admit such a person temporarily as a nonimmigrant. Under this authority, INS issued an administrative directive waiving the testing requirement for an alien who is entering the U.S. for 30 days or less first, to attend educational or medical conferences, second, to receive medical treatment, third, to visit close family members, or fourth, to conduct temporary business activities.

I want to make it clear that my support for section 2007 of the NIH Revitalization Act does not mean that I support the bill as a whole. There are several provisions in S. 1

that I cannot support, and I will therefore vote against the conference report.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY].

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. I do so because these institutes are more than Institutes of Health, they are, to many Americans, the National Institutes of Hope.

The life-saving work done at NIH gives hope to millions of Americans.

It offers hope to Anthony Colletta of Flushing, NY, who has lived with diabetes for over 5 years himself and who saw his own father die of this tragic disease.

It offers hope to Maureen Spies of Forest Hills, NY, who is undergoing chemotherapy for breast cancer after having lost her own mother and aunt to the tragedy of breast cancer and to the millions of other women who live knowing that they could be the one woman out of nine who will be a victim of breast cancer.

It offers hope to 8-year-old Sara Siegel of Harrison, NY, who has fought juvenile diabetes for over 4 years.

It offers hope to Jane Perlmutter of New Rochelle, NY, and hundreds of thousands of others who suffer from chronic fatigue syndrome.

It offers hope to 4-year-old Danny Potocki of Pelham, NY, as he fights acute leukemia.

And there is good reason for their hope. These institutes have truly saved lives. Thanks to NIH work, over the last two decades, heart disease fatalities have been reduced by 39 percent. Deaths due to stroke have been cut by 58 percent. Five-year cancer survival rates have increased by 52 percent.

Mr. Speaker, to all of those I mentioned earlier and millions like them, our action today in passing this legislation and our commitment to the work of these institutes over the long term gives real hope for healthier lives, for longer lives. No investment that we make could be more worthwhile. NIH is indeed the institute of hope.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to acknowledge the work by a number of people in presenting this legislation to us today, people who have worked long and hard over the numbers of years that we have labored to get this bill to the floor: From the full Committee on Energy and Commerce, Suzanne Rudzinski; for our own Subcommittee on Health and Environment, Tim Westmoreland, Ruth Katz, and Ripley Forbes; from the legislative counsel's office, Peter Goodloe.

We had a number of people from the outside who have worked strenuously

lobbying, knocking on doors, to explain why they feel that tissue research should be permitted. I want to mention Joan Samuelson, Guy and Terri Walden and their son Nathan, Anne Udall, Trudy and Howard Jacobson, and Judy Culpepper.

Then there were thousands of others around the country who said this bill did offer hope to them, hope of a cure, a prevention, a control of diseases that affected members of their families or themselves.

The National Institutes of Health is the gem of the Federal Government's efforts to combat disease. I urge an aye vote for this legislation.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to rise in support of the conference report accompanying S. 1, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993.

Many people have worked long and hard to bring this bill to fruition. I would like to thank Mr. WAXMAN for his hard work in managing the bill and for successfully resolving many difficult and contentious issues.

I would also like to thank: Mr. WYDEN for his hard work on the bill and as a conferee; and Mr. BROOKS, Mr. MAZZOLI, and Mr. MCCOLLUM for their work as conferees on the provision concerning immigration of HIV-infected individuals.

I also thank Mr. FORD for his work as a conferee on the low-income housing energy assistance provision; and Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. BLILEY for handling the bill in a gentlemanly fashion even though they disagree on the merits of several provisions of the bill.

FRED UPTON also deserves thanks for his leadership on fetal tissue transplantation research. And a special thanks to the Women's caucus and its efforts in support of the bill.

This conference report is the culmination of the efforts of the House and Senate to resolve a number of technical differences.

This comprehensive legislative package addresses a wide variety of health research issues. These issues are vital to maintaining the NIH as the world's foremost biomedical and behavioral research center.

Among other things, the bill reauthorizes the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute.

It will improve research on women's and minorities' health. The bill include special initiatives on fetal tissue transplantation research, and on breast, ovarian, and prostate cancer.

Additionally, it establishes an Office of Research Integrity to investigate allegations of research misconduct and to protect whistleblowers to report allegations of such misconduct.

The research activities covered by this bill are critically important to the future quality of our Nation's health care. These activities represent the most productive investment funded by the Federal dollar.

New discoveries in disease prevention and treatment greatly reduce the enormous burden of human suffering and economic loss inflicted by illness.

For example, fetal tissue transplantation research holds the promise for new breakthroughs. These breakthroughs will help to reduce the suffering of millions of Americans

suffering from previously incurable, debilitating diseases such as Parkinson's disease, Alzheimer's disease and diabetes.

The conference agreement is also faithful to the instructions of the House to address the issue of immigration of individuals infected with HIV. The House conferees offered, and the Senate accepted, language recommended by Congressman MCCOLLUM.

That language maintains current prohibitions in law on immigration of such individuals. This is the same language that some Members sought to make in order when the House originally considered the NIH bill. However, it was not included at that time because it was not germane to the bill.

In conclusion, reauthorization of the NIH programs will ensure that we obtain the scientific knowledge necessary to prevent disease, improve the quality of health care, prolong life, and share the effectiveness of the American health care system.

I strongly support this legislation and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 1, the bill that will reauthorize funding for the institutes, centers and divisions of the National Institutes of Health [NIH] for the first time since 1988. If S. 1 is enacted, it will enable America's top scientists and researchers to continue the crucial research that will lead to the new knowledge necessary for preventing, detecting, diagnosing, and treating disease and disability.

NIH research encompasses juvenile diabetes, as well as heart disease and arthritis in our children, and results in immunizations against the infectious diseases that threaten them. It has resulted in decreases in both heart disease and stroke mortality in Americans of all ages.

S. 1 continues in this tradition by providing for research on the development of new and improved childhood vaccines, as well as on juvenile arthritis, multiple sclerosis, and nutritional disorders and obesity. The reauthorization also streamlines and coordinates AIDS research, avoiding wasteful duplication and paving the way for a more efficient approach to combatting this deadly disease.

Recognizing that, in the course of a lifetime, one in every three Americans is expected to contract some form of cancer, S. 1 includes a provision enabling all States to set up cancer registries—for all cancers—operating under uniform standards. It also expands research for cancer, fertility and contraception, and osteoporosis—a disease to which so many American women fall prey and which is a major cause of chronic disability in our elderly.

One out of every nine women in this country will develop breast cancer; this year alone, tens of thousands of American women will die from this terrible disease. Therefore, S. 1 establishes the first congressional program targeted specifically at breast cancer prevention and cure. It increases research on the causes and prevention of breast cancer, ovarian cancer, and cervical cancer. It also requires that women and minorities be included in clinical research studies, where appropriate, and establishes a permanent Office for Research on Women's Health within the NIH. There is also a provision that increases research and prevention programs in prostate cancer, a dis-

ease that is diagnosed in 132,000 American men every year and that kills 34,000 American men annually—second only to lung cancer.

American families are being overwhelmed by the financial and emotional strain that results when a child, parent, or spouse—any loved one—is stricken with diabetes or heart disease or Alzheimer's or a stroke. I have received numerous letters and phone calls from such families in my district—the families who have a stake in the work of the NIH. These are the Americans whose hopes hinge on the discovery of a cure for juvenile diabetes, for cancer, for kidney disease, for arthritis. We therefore have to support NIH research. We cannot afford not to invest in the kind of life-saving research that S. 1 authorizes, because it is such an important part of the foundation of our health care system.

An investment in the work of the NIH is one of the best ways we have of preventing the costly treatment that too often follows when serious illness strikes. If an ounce of prevention is really worth a pound of cure, it makes good common sense to pass this bill now so that we can get on with the business of tackling the major health care reform challenges that are before us.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Chairman WAXMAN and his subcommittee for their efforts in bringing this bill to the floor and for reminding us of the challenge that remains—the challenge for us to better prevent and treat cancer, diabetes, heart disease, kidney disease, stroke, Alzheimer's disease, AIDS, blindness and arthritis, and to better understand both the aging process and the lifestyle practices that affect our health. NIH research is one of the best tools we have in meeting this challenge.

This is not a partisan issue. It is a health care issue. Mr. Speaker, I therefore urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to make an up-front investment in the health and the quality of life of all Americans, by supporting the conference report on the bill reauthorizing our National Institutes of Health.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of the conference report on S. 1, the NIH Revitalization Act of 1993.

Many Americans will never know how much research performed at the National Institutes of Health has helped them to live healthier, more productive lives. Many of us have family and friends who have already benefited tremendously from breakthroughs made at NIH.

But we will gain even richer rewards in the future, because this legislation provides NIH with the means necessary to investigate and conquer terrible diseases into the next century. Think of the women who will now have a better chance to survive breast cancer because of the funding this legislation provides for breast cancer research at the National Cancer Institute. Or for the expansion of the National Heart, Blood, and Lung Institute to provide improved training and education to cure these diseases. This legislation reaches out to help Americans of all ages by providing additional research in the area of pediatrics, as well as calling for the establishment of a research program to look into the causes and treatments of osteoporosis.

This legislation is an investment, an investment in the health and well being of Ameri-

cans. Our ability to research and combat disease has already led to a dramatic increase in lifespan. Now it is time to build on these gains. I am pleased to give my support to this conference report, and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I support the conference report on the NIH reauthorization.

The bill contains important authorizations for our Nation's premier biomedical research institutions. It puts a new emphasis on chronic fatigue syndrome [CFS] and sleep disorders research, two areas which have not received the level of attention they deserve.

In addition, the bill would continue to permit researchers to conduct studies involving the transplantation of fetal tissue—studies which offer the hope of developing effective treatments for Parkinson's and possibly Alzheimer's and could conceivably yield a cure for diabetes.

Mr. Speaker, I find it truly sad that a tangential argument on abortion, which would not be affected by this legislation, threatens to derail important and potentially life saving research.

If opponents have their way, and succeed in blocking research on fetal tissue, not one less abortion will be performed in this country. Put another way, if we do the right thing and allow researchers to study fetal tissue subject to stringent ethical guidelines, not one additional abortion will be performed in this country.

The safeguards in this bill clearly separate the decision to have an abortion from the decision to donate fetal tissue. Decisions or discussions involving donation of fetal tissue cannot take place until after a woman has made the decision to have an abortion.

While the issue of fetal tissue research clearly involves abortion, it is in no way about abortion, and will certainly not encourage abortion.

A vote to oppose fetal tissue research does not limit access to or availability of abortions. It simply ensures that tissue that might otherwise be used to benefit society will be tossed on the medical waste heap. And it destroys the hope of millions of Americans who suffer from potentially curable and treatable diseases.

I support the NIH bill and urge all Members to vote for it.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 1, the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act of 1993. The NIH is a renowned and respected institution which has been at the forefront of the battle against the diseases that plague our Nation. The legislation before us today is significant in its commitment to furthering the important mission of the NIH by increasing its emphasis on AIDS research, as well as on those health problems that affect American women and minorities.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation affirms the commitment to biomedical research, and the search for cures to such horrible diseases as AIDS and cancer. At the same time, it acts on behalf of our future generations by establishing a children's vaccine initiative that guarantees better access and protection for a larger number of our children, thereby preventing the unnecessary spread of diseases.

I am also gratified to see that this bill takes a particularly meaningful step toward improv-

ing health care for women and minorities. It requires the inclusion of women and minorities as subjects in NIH-funded research, as well as establishing an Office of Research on Women's Health, and an Office of Research on Minority Health. This legislation also establishes a national women's health data bank to assist in the coordination and dissemination of women's health research, allowing the NIH to focus on health problems that disproportionately affect women. Furthermore, this bill authorizes important additional funds for diseases such as breast cancer and osteoporosis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the NIH Revitalization Act. By giving full support to the important research at NIH, we are making a strong commitment to the future health of our Nation as a whole.

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. I rise today in strong support of the conference report on S. 1, the NIH Authorization Act. This is a landmark piece of legislation that promotes research in areas that historically have been overlooked or simply ignored.

The NIH conference report authorizes a total of \$6.2 billion in fiscal year 1994, including \$100 million for breast cancer research, and \$75 million for breast cancer detection and prevention. The bill also requires NIH to include women and minorities in clinical research trials and permanently establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health, whose purpose is to identify projects of women's health research that should be supported and to monitor the inclusion of women in clinical trials.

For years women have been excluded from clinical trials for methods of treatment because researchers assumed that men could serve as the sample for both sexes. Researchers feared that women of child-bearing age would be placed at risk if they had taken experimental medication. The end result is that women are diagnosed in the latter stages of a particular disease when it may be too late to receive proper treatment. Minority women, in particular, have suffered tremendously due to the lack of research, or because they are unaware of prevention and detection measures.

Unfortunately, the strides this bill takes in health research are tainted by the scourge of discrimination. The NIH conference report includes a provision that will codify the regulatory ban on the permanent admission into the United States of immigrants infected with the HIV virus. One of my greatest concerns is the way in which immigration officials will determine who is infected. Will they single out Haitians because the United States had erroneously labeled them as primary carriers of the virus? Will Europeans be subject to the same scrutiny? We are setting a disturbing precedent in this country, one that contradicts the fabric that once wove this country together and constantly expanded to include all people from around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, as they support the NIH conference report, to take a long, hard look at the implications of this ban. While I am keenly aware of the dangers of HIV and AIDS, I do not believe that banning people from this country will do anything to stop the spread of the disease. We desperately need research and education to help eliminate AIDS, not barriers and blockades.

Mr. ORTON. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add some remarks to those of my distinguished colleagues concerning the conference report on S. 1, National Institutes of Health Authorization. I have voted against this bill in the past because of my opposition to the provisions on fetal tissue research, which I have attempted to change through amendment. While I have thus far not been successful in this effort, I recognize the importance of the many good programs and projects in other provisions of this bill and therefore will vote in favor of its final passage.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the many good programs and research projects that are authorized by this legislation.

This legislation includes virtually all of the provisions of the NIH bill that was overwhelmingly passed by the Congress last year and vetoed by President Bush. It includes provisions from last year's bill on women's health and increases funding for research on breast cancer, ovarian and cervical cancer, osteoporosis, and reproductive health. The bill goes even further and establishes within the Office of the Director of NIH, and Office of Research on Women's Health.

We often read about important medical breakthroughs that unlock the mystery of disease and give hope to afflicted patients and their families. Such advances do not occur overnight. They are the result of years of adding to our existing knowledge. In the world of science, we are never quite sure which experiment or project will unlock the door to a cure. We do know that unfunded research efforts and lack of commitment get us nowhere.

One disease in particular that plagues our Nation is breast cancer. The rate of breast cancer has increased for the past 20 years. Several thousand women will die of this disease this year alone, and we still know very little about its cause or cure. In June 1991, I joined with my colleagues on the congressional caucus for women's issues to challenge our medical community to find the causes and cure for breast cancer research by the year 2000. Dr. Sam Broder, Director of the National Cancer Institute, accepted our challenge provided the Institute be given the resources to succeed. The bill before us today contains the stimulus needed to activate the NCI research efforts in order to free the lives of women from breast cancer through an increased emphasis on basic and clinical research and through improved education and outreach programs, and continues the commitment to eradicating this dreaded disease that plagues our Nation.

The conference report also includes several other very important provisions that will help us to move closer to understanding, treating, and ultimately curing diseases that cause so much needless suffering and loss of human life. It also includes language to overturn the Bush administration's ban on fetal tissue research. Such research has shown great promise in treating such diseases as Parkinson's disease, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, and other disabling conditions, and is considered a critical component of research by our medical research community. I'm sure many of us have heard the horror stories from patients suffering with Parkinson's disease and hoping

all the time that our Nation finds a cure for this illness. I think it's important to note that this bill includes numerous safeguards against potential abuse in fetal tissue transplantation research.

I am also pleased to note that the conference report contains legislation which I introduced with my colleagues, Representative WYDEN, former Representative Downey, and former Senator Adams and Senator BINGAMAN, which will provide for two studies to address the serious problem of malnutrition and the elderly.

These are diseases that affect every one of us. If not individually, they affect a member of our family. The future of our health lies in jeopardy. As I have said before, improving the Nation's research commitment is fundamental to improving the health care received in this country. This is truly a human life bill and I hope all of my colleagues will support its passage.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the conference report on the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act.

This bill signifies great hope for the women of America—hope that one day, breast cancer will no longer be the most prevalent disease in women, hope that there will soon be an early detection test for ovarian cancer, hope that new information about the prevention of heart disease in women will mean that it is no longer the No. 1 killer of women in this country.

Mr. Speaker, many of us, particularly the women in Congress have worked very hard over the last 2 years to pass this legislation, which includes the most comprehensive women's health initiative ever to be considered in the Congress. These provisions signify that women will no longer have to take a back seat when it comes to biomedical research.

The NIH reauthorization bill permanently establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health to coordinate and monitor women's health research at the NIH. It requires the inclusion of women, minorities, and disadvantaged individuals in clinical research trials. It provides \$355 million for basic and clinical breast cancer research, and \$30 million for contraceptive and infertility research.

The bill also includes \$75 million for research on ovarian and other reproductive cancers, a provision of great importance to me. Since I returned to the Congress in 1990, one of my priorities has been to increase Federal funding of research on ovarian cancer. Ovarian cancer is perhaps the most compelling example of the kind of neglect women's health has suffered over the last century.

As ovarian cancer continues to threaten over 21,000 women each year, there is still no early detection test to diagnose this disease in its early stages. The result is that two-thirds of the women with this terrible disease will die.

In the 102d and the 103d Congress, I introduced legislation to increase Federal dollars for ovarian cancer research, and I am pleased that the bill agreed upon in conference is in line with my legislation and will provide for \$75 million for research on ovarian and other reproductive cancers.

Mr. Speaker, this investment in ovarian cancer research gives us hope that one day soon an early detection test will be found, that the

genetic link which causes certain families to be afflicted by ovarian cancer at higher rates, will be identified, and most of all, it gives us hope that future generations of women with ovarian cancer will have a much greater chance of living full, productive, and very long lives.

I urge my colleagues to support the conference report on the National Institutes of Health Revitalization Act so that we can improve the health and lives of the women, men, and children of this country.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees, and as a conferee on the provision in the NIH bill regarding the exclusion of HIV-infected aliens, I rise in support of the position taken by the conference committee on that issue.

The provision in the conference report reflects the overwhelming sentiment in both the House and the Senate for retaining the current policy of excluding from the United States aliens infected with the human immunodeficiency virus, HIV.

We do this because of the high costs of caring for AIDS victims and to protect the health of our citizens.

The approach taken by the conference committee was bipartisan and the provision in the report is identical to H.R. 985, a bill introduced by the ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees, Mr. MCCOLLUM.

This provision requires that HIV infection be deemed a communicable disease of public health significance for immigration purposes. By any commonsense understanding, HIV infection is both communicable, and of public health significance.

This provision is the simplest and most direct approach to take on the issue and is fully consistent with the motion to instruct, which passed this body by a vote of 356 to 58.

The provision codifies the current policy that HIV-infected aliens be excluded, without making other unnecessary and complicated changes to our immigration laws.

Current immigration law allows the Attorney General to waive the health-related exclusion ground for nonimmigrants, refugees, and close relatives of citizens and permanent residents.

The Immigration and Nationality Act does not specify the circumstances under which an alien shall be required to undergo a medical examination to determine the existence of an excludable disease, nor does the act specify the circumstances under which an alien seeking admission should be questioned about the alien's medical condition.

Regulations, policies, and practices have developed with regard to waivers of exclusion, testing requirements, and health-related questioning. The conferees, by requiring that HIV be included among the list of excludable diseases until such time as Congress shall remove it, have taken the position that waiver, questioning, and testing decisions should continue to be left to the discretion of the Attorney General. Thus, the conference report does not codify any current policies or practices concerning those authorities.

I commend my fellow conferees for adopting a well-crafted provision.

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the National Institutes of

Health revitalization bill and I commend my colleague from California, HENRY WAXMAN, for his indefatigable work to get this measure enacted.

This bill represents a historic change, the kind of change the people demanded in the last election. It is no coincidence that, in a session where we have doubled the number of women in the House of Representatives, we are about to enact the first NIH authorization that truly recognizes the need to address women's health issue. For years, women have been tragically shortchanged when it came to health research. Breast cancer research has been neglected. Research into gynecological cancers has been neglected. And contraceptive and infertility research has been neglected. With this bill, we begin to end that neglect. For the first time in a decade, we have an administration that is committed to making sure that the diseases that strike at women are given the attention they deserve.

This bill will permanently establish the Office of Research on Women's Health, ensuring that there will always be a voice for women inside NIH. Moreover, there will be an Advisory Committee set up, including outside health and research experts to advise the Office. This Office will also monitor the status of women physicians and scientists at NIH and at NIH-funded institutions and it will carry out appropriate activities to increase the representation of women as senior scientists and physicians.

In addition, the bill substantially increases funding for both basic and clinical research into breast cancer, provides new funding for ovarian and other reproductive cancers, and establishes new contraceptive and infertility research centers. For older women, the bill directs the NIH Director to establish a research program on osteoporosis and related bone disorders. For younger women, there is a study on the general health and well-being of adolescents, which will be coordinated with the women's health initiative.

This measure is long overdue. Many people have worked long and hard to get us to this point. As a woman, a mother, and a daughter, I am proud to cast my vote for this ground-breaking legislation.

Ms. WOOLSEY Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend my California colleague, Chairman WAXMAN, for his diligent work in crafting this important legislation. This is a much needed initiative, and I urge by colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this conference report.

This legislation makes huge strides toward equity in women's health research. It requires that women and minorities be included in clinical research trials, so that we can be sure that results from the trials are applicable across race and gender. It also permanently establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health at NIH, which will promote the inclusion of women as senior scientists and doctors and will advise NIH on the ground-breaking areas of women's health.

I strongly support the increased funding for research on breast and ovarian cancer, osteoporosis, and infertility which is a key part of this legislation. This funding is crucial to developing a cure for the many millions of women suffering from these illnesses.

This legislation is long overdue, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on final passage.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express strong and enthusiastic support for the breast cancer study provisions of the conference report on the National Institutes of Health [NIH] Revitalization Act of 1993 (S. 1). With this measure now on the verge of final passage, I want to commend my colleagues from the Long Island delegation for joining with me in a successful bipartisan effort to address the serious public health threat posed by breast cancer in our home region.

Today, Congress is finally recognizing the hardship inflicted on Long Island women and their families by breast cancer and is beginning efforts to find out why our area has suffered so much from this disease. This legislation specifically singles out Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island for a special in-depth study of the environmental factors that may contribute to breast cancer. The study will be performed by the Nation's top experts at NIH's National Cancer Institute.

While women across the country suffer from breast cancer, the fact is that women in Nassau County face even greater odds of being stricken. Between 1984 and 1988, the breast cancer mortality rate for one group of women in Nassau County was 16 percent higher than that of New York State and 36 percent higher than that of the Nation. It is time for the Federal Government to get more actively involved in the fight against this killer.

Recently, I joined with a number of Members of Congress in sending a letter to President Clinton urging him to support the development of a comprehensive national breast cancer strategy. With 180,000 new cases of breast cancer—and 46,000 deaths—reported last year, we are facing nothing less than a public health emergency.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to continuing to work closely with the Clinton administration, the experts at NIH, the Long Island delegation, and other Members of the House to aggressively pursue answers to the mysteries of breast cancer. We cannot stop until a cure is found.

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 1, legislation to reauthorize the National Institutes of Health.

As we all know, we are in the midst of a health care crisis in this country. A crisis that is forcing us to reexamine many of the fundamental principles around which our health care system is built. We are not only doing this because the rising cost of health care is damaging our entire national economy, but also because of the byproducts of our health care system, such as our high infant mortality rates. We spend more on health care than any other country, but the majority of American people are not getting the best possible health care.

Mr. Speaker, not everyone agrees with this conclusion, but, what cannot be disputed, however, is the assertion that the biomedical research community in this country is not equal anywhere in the world. Whenever we hear of another major breakthrough in our fight against diseases, we are likely to find that this research was accomplished in an American research laboratory.

This ground-breaking research is more likely to be supported by one of the foremost lead-

ers in research, the National Institutes of Health. The NIH, Mr. Speaker, is truly the foundation upon which our entire biomedical research community stands, and, for this reason, it is essential that we act decisively to enable this institution to continue its good work.

I would also like to take this opportunity to bring to your attention an organization that has been a partner in the fine work of the National Institutes of Health, the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia, which is located in my district. It is one of the foremost providers of care for children as well as one of our premier pediatric research institutes. Over the years, researchers at the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia have been at the forefront of new and better ways to treat congenital heart defects, premature birth, rubella, mumps, influenza, and other medical problems. Today, these researchers are working on new developments involving cystic fibrosis, leukemia, sickle cell disease, asthma, diabetes, and mental retardation.

Mr. Speaker, one of Children's Hospital of Philadelphia's most recent activities, and an endeavor of which I am particularly proud, is its participation in the human genome project. With support from NIH, the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia has become the world's foremost authority on Chromosomes No. 22, which is often referred to as the Philadelphia Chromosome. Mr. Speaker, several months have passed since the hospital's research made headlines with a new discovery that doctors hope will lead to major improvements in the fight against cancer.

In my opinion, that is what NIH is all about. The private sector cannot generate funds sufficient to support this kind of research. All of the telephone and door-to-door solicitations, bake sales, or raffles cannot generate funds sufficient to support such research.

Only the National Institutes of Health can do so. Only the NIH has consistently had both the good judgment to select these and other worthy projects for further study as well as to allocate the resources with which to support this kind of work.

Mr. Speaker, as a Philadelphian, I have witnessed, time and time again, the life saving care provided by Children's Hospital of Philadelphia.

As an American, I am proud that the research that the hospital has done has improved and saved the lives of children, here and around the world. I cannot think of a more worthy use of our Nation's resources.

Mr. Speaker, as a Member of this House, I urge my colleagues to support the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health, by voting in favor of S. 1. By doing so, we can reaffirm our commitment to the preservation and improvement of lives everywhere.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased and proud to rise today in support of the conference report of H.R. 4, the National Institutes of Health [NIH] Revitalization Act of 1993. This is a comprehensive landmark bill that finally addresses the needs of most Americans. For years, the NIH focused its funds and research primarily on diseases affecting nonminority males. Meanwhile, the number of women dying of breast cancer was soaring, African-Americans and Hispanic-Americans continued to suffer disproportion-

ately from AIDS, diabetes, glaucoma, and other diseases and the hard, cold reality was that the needs of most Americans were simply not being studied or addressed. With the passage of H.R. 4, however, the NIH will be specifically and fully focused on the areas where America's health is most at risk.

Some of the provisions of H.R. 4 that are particularly important and assure that the NIH's interests are consistent with America's needs are the requirement that all Americans be included in clinical research trials and the required expansion of the National Research Service Awards Program to ensure the inclusion of women and individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds in the field of biomedical and behavioral research.

In addition, H.R. 4 permanently establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health to oversee efforts to improve women's health. The duties of the Office would include serving as a clearinghouse on women's health research, working to increase the number of female senior scientists and physicians at NIH, and to monitor the inclusion of women in clinical trials. To add bite to the bark on our efforts to improve women's health, H.R. 4 would provide key increases in funding for research on breast, ovarian, and cervical cancers, osteoporosis, and reproductive health.

I am also particularly pleased that H.R. 4 includes a provision which was added by my amendment in the Energy and Commerce Committee that institutionalizes an Office on Minority Health within the Office of the Director of NIH. The establishment of this Office ensures that the health of minorities will receive increased research and enhanced attention.

Increased concern about the health of minorities is critical to closing the gap between the health of minorities and nonminorities in America. The mortality rate of many diseases, such as heart disease, strokes, diabetes, liver cirrhosis, breast cancer, and glaucoma are significantly higher in the minority community. Yet, the reasons for this are not clear. Life-styles may play a role in the high mortality rate but scientific, multidisciplinary studies must be done to determine the underlying medical cause of these disparate rates of disease. Although there have already been some studies done on minority-prone diseases, it is crucial that NIH, our premiere national research institution with the capability for real progress, takes the lead on this research. The establishment of the Office on Minority Health will ensure exactly this and begin to close the horrifying mortality gap for minorities.

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons I just mentioned, and for many others, I heartily support H.R. 4. Despite my opposition to the codification of the unfair ban on the permanent admission of individuals infected with the AIDS virus, I urge my colleagues to join me and vote for H.R. 4.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today, the House takes the final step in the long road to passing a strong NIH reauthorization bill. The conference report on S. 1 authorizes research which has the potential to save the lives of thousands of men, women, and children. Intensified research efforts will be specifically authorized for childhood vaccines, osteoporosis, prostate cancer, AIDS, and breast, cervical, and ovarian cancer.

For years, women's health concerns have been systematically ignored. Often overlooked by researchers and left out of clinical trials, women are suffering and dying because not enough has been done in the past to find cures or treatments for the diseases that afflict them. Therefore, I believe the conference report's provisions for women's health research are an important and integral part of this legislation. When this bill becomes law, the NIH will be required, except in certain circumstances, to include women and minorities in NIH-funded research projects.

I believe so strongly in the need to include women in this research because I have experienced past neglect first hand. By chance, I was diagnosed with ovarian cancer, and by luck I survived a disease that kills 13,000 women in this country each year. Since then, I have joined other women with similar experiences, and Members of Congress in working to make certain that women's health concerns are a central component of our national health care debate.

This bill makes important strides in redressing past neglect of research into diseases that specifically strike women. It authorizes \$225 million for basic breast cancer research, \$100 million for breast cancer detection and prevention, and \$75 million for gynecological cancer research.

We cannot continue to ignore the diseases that affect our daughters and mothers. We must heighten awareness that the diseases affecting women have to be understood, analyzed, and treated with the same care and diligence with which we fight all other diseases. The bill helps to do that. It puts some balance into medical research, and provides millions of American women with the hope that their medical needs may be met.

We must invest in research if we are to have healthier children and families. We must make the commitment today so that we save lives and precious health care dollars tomorrow. I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on S. 1, the bill to reauthorize the important programs funded by the National Institutes of Health.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have mixed feelings about the final version of this bill. On the one hand, the legislation authorizes generous levels of funding for a number of critical health initiatives, particularly programs affecting women. On the other hand, the conference report leaves largely intact the language inserted by the Senate which codifies the ban on the admission into the United States of immigrants with the HIV virus.

First, let me commend the gentleman from California, Chairman HENRY WAXMAN, on putting together a bill which makes enormous progress in several key areas. As the mother of two young daughters, I don't want them to grow up as I did, as my generation did—basically in the dark about the major health risks women face.

That's why I am pleased that the conference agreement retains \$335 million for increased breast cancer research and \$75 million for gynecological research. The bill also permanently establishes the Office of Research on Women's Health which will help ensure Fed-

eral support of women's health research projects.

In addition, I strongly support the funding contained in the bill for prostate cancer research, AIDS research, and the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute, and National Institute on Aging.

Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 4 passed the House on March 10, there was a great deal of concern in this body about language passed by the Senate concerning the admission of HIV-infected individuals into the country. The Senate provision would have placed a near-total ban on the admission of HIV-positive people except where the Attorney General granted a waiver of 30 days or less to a traveler visiting our country.

In my view, the Senate language was unacceptable. It codifies a policy, enacted in the Reagan administration, which is universally opposed by public health officials, including both Republican and Democratic Secretaries of Health and Human Services. To single out HIV-infected people as the only individuals with a disease statutorily banned from our country is, in my mind, an exercise in demagoguery and discrimination.

Chairman WAXMAN did the best he could in the conference committee to change the Senate language, and thanks to him, some small steps in the right direction were achieved. The conference report allows the Attorney General to grant waivers from this exclusion to HIV-positive visitors to our country for up to 6 months. Waivers may also be given to permanent immigrants with the HIV virus if they have immediate family members in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I support the NIH reauthorization bill because offers so much hope for so many sick people. But I cannot support the ban on HIV-positive immigration, and I sincerely hope that the day will come when this inhumane policy will be reversed.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). The question is on the conference report.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 290, nays 130, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 178]

YEAS—290

Abercrombie	Baessler	Bilbray
Ackerman	Barlow	Bishop
Andrews (ME)	Barrett (WI)	Blute
Andrews (NJ)	Becerra	Boehert
Andrews (TX)	Beilenson	Bonilla
Applegate	Bentley	Borski
Bacchus (FL)	Bevill	Boucher

Brewster	Horn	Payne (VA)
Brooks	Houghton	Pelosi
Browder	Hoyer	Penny
Brown (CA)	Huffington	Peterson (FL)
Brown (FL)	Hughes	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Inslee	Pickle
Bryant	Jacobs	Pomeroy
Byrne	Jefferson	Porter
Cantwell	Johnson (CT)	Price (NC)
Cardin	Johnson (GA)	Pryce (OH)
Carr	Johnson (SD)	Ramstad
Chapman	Johnson, E. B.	Rangel
Clay	Johnston	Reed
Clayton	Kanjorski	Regula
Clement	Kaptur	Reynolds
Clyburn	Kennedy	Richardson
Coleman	Kennelly	Ridge
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Rose
Collins (MI)	Kim	Rostenkowski
Condit	Kleczka	Roukema
Cooper	Klein	Rowland
Coppersmith	Klink	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Klug	Rush
Coyne	Kolbe	Sabo
Cramer	Kopetski	Sanders
Danner	Kreidler	Sargmeister
Darden	LaFalce	Sarpallius
Deal	Lambert	Sawyer
DeFazio	Lancaster	Schenk
DeLauro	Lantos	Schiff
Dellums	LaRocco	Schroeder
Derrick	Laughlin	Schumer
Deutsch	Lazio	Scott
Dicks	Lehman	Serrano
Dingell	Levin	Sharp
Dixon	Levy	Shaw
Dooley	Lewis (FL)	Shays
Dunn	Lewis (GA)	Shepherd
Durbin	Lipinski	Shuster
Edwards (CA)	Lloyd	Sisisky
Edwards (TX)	Long	Skaggs
English (AZ)	Lowey	Slattery
English (OK)	Machtley	Slaughter
Eshoo	Maloney	Smith (IA)
Evans	Mann	Smith (TX)
Fawell	Manton	Snowe
Fazio	Margolies-	Spence
Fields (LA)	Mezvinsky	Spratt
Filner	Markay	Stark
Fingerhut	Martinez	Stenholm
Fish	Matsui	Stokes
Flake	Mazzoli	Strickland
Foglietta	McCloskey	Studds
Ford (MI)	McCurdy	Stupak
Ford (TN)	McDermott	Swett
Fowler	McHale	Swift
Frank (MA)	McHugh	Synar
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Tanner
Franks (NJ)	McKinney	Tejeda
Frost	McMillan	Thomas (CA)
Furse	McNulty	Thomas (WY)
Galleghy	Meehan	Thornton
Gallo	Meek	Thurman
Gejdenson	Menendez	Torkildsen
Gekas	Meyers	Torres
Gephardt	Mfume	Torricelli
Geren	Miller (CA)	Towns
Gibbons	Miller (FL)	Trafficant
Glitchest	Mineta	Tucker
Gillmor	Minge	Unsoeld
Gilman	Mink	Upton
Glickman	Moakley	Valentine
Gonzalez	Molinari	Velazquez
Gordon	Montgomery	Vento
Grandy	Moran	Visclosky
Green	Morella	Walsh
Greenwood	Murtha	Washington
Gunderson	Nadler	Waters
Gutierrez	Natcher	Watt
Hall (TX)	Neal (MA)	Waxman
Hamburg	Neal (NC)	Wheat
Hamilton	Oberstar	Wilson
Harman	Obey	Wise
Hastings	Oliver	Woolsey
Hefner	Orton	Wyden
Hinchey	Owens	Wynn
Hoagland	Pallone	Yates
Hobson	Parker	Young (AK)
Hochbrueckner	Pastor	Zeliff
Holden	Payne (NJ)	Zimmer

NAYS—130

Allard	Bachus (AL)	Ballenger
Archer	Baker (CA)	Barcia
Armey	Baker (LA)	Barrett (NE)

Bartlett	Hancock	Peterson (MN)
Barton	Hansen	Petri
Bateman	Hastert	Pombo
Bereuter	Hayes	Portman
Bilirakis	Hefley	Poshard
Bliley	Herger	Quillen
Boehner	Hoekstra	Quinn
Bunning	Hoke	Rahall
Burton	Hunter	Ravenel
Buyer	Hutchinson	Roberts
Callahan	Hutto	Roemer
Calvert	Hyde	Rogers
Camp	Inglis	Rohrabacher
Canady	Inhofe	Ros-Lehtinen
Castle	Istook	Roth
Clinger	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Coble	Kasich	Santorum
Collins (GA)	King	Saxton
Combest	Kingston	Schaefer
Cox	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Crane	Kyl	Skeen
Crapo	Lightfoot	Skelton
Cunningham	Linder	Smith (MI)
de la Garza	Livingston	Smith (NJ)
DeLay	Manzullo	Smith (OR)
Diaz-Balart	McCandless	Solomon
Dickey	McCollum	Stearns
Doolittle	McCrery	Stump
Dornan	McDade	Sundquist
Dreier	McKeon	Talent
Duncan	Mica	Tauzin
Emerson	Michel	Taylor (MS)
Everett	Mollohan	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	Moorhead	Volkmer
Fields (TX)	Murphy	Vucanovich
Gingrich	Myers	Walker
Goodlatte	Nussle	Weldon
Goodling	Ortiz	Wolf
Goss	Oxley	Young (FL)
Grams	Packard	
Hall (OH)	Paxon	

NOT VOTING—12

Berman	Engel	Lewis (CA)
Blackwell	Henry	Thompson
Bonior	Hilliard	Whitten
Conyers	Leach	Williams

□ 1420

Mr. DICKEY and Mr. ORTIZ changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. OWENS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 178 on the conference report on re-authorizing the National Institutes of Health. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea".

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON THE OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Budget have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MONTGOMERY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

CONTINUATION OF EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA (SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO)—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-91)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1622(d)) provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, prior to the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the Federal Register and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) is to continue in effect beyond May 30, 1993, to the Federal Register for publication.

The circumstances that led to the declaration on May 30, 1992, of a national emergency have not been resolved. The Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) continues to support groups seizing and attempting to seize territory in the Republics of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence. The actions and policies of the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) pose a continuing unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, vital foreign policy interests, and the economy of the United States. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to maintain in force the broad authorities necessary to apply economic pressure to the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to reduce its ability to support the continuing civil strife and bloodshed in the former Yugoslavia.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 25, 1993.

REPORT ON ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS AND EXPENSES RELATING TO EXERCISE OF POWERS AND AUTHORITIES AND SANCTIONS AGAINST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA (SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO)—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 103-92)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message

from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

On May 30, 1992, in Executive Order No. 12808, President Bush declared a national emergency to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States arising from actions and policies of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, acting under the name of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in their involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize territory in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence utilizing, in part, the forces of the so-called Yugoslav National Army (57 FR 23299, June 2, 1992). The present report is submitted pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) and 1703(c). It discusses Administration actions and expenses directly related to the exercise of powers and authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency in Executive Order No. 12808 and to expanded sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) (the "FRY (S/M)") contained in Executive Order No. 12810 of June 5, 1992 (57 FR 24347, June 9, 1992), Executive Order No. 12831 of January 15, 1993 (58 FR 5253, January 21, 1993), and Executive Order No. 12846 of April 26, 1993 (58 FR 25771, April 27, 1993).

1. Executive Order No. 12808 blocked all property and interests in property of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro, or held in the name of the former Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia or the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, then or thereafter located in the United States or within the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches.

Subsequently, Executive Order No. 12810 expanded U.S. actions to implement in the United States the U.N. sanctions against the FRY (S/M) adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 757 of May 30, 1992. In addition to reaffirming the blocking of FRY (S/M) Government property, this order prohibits transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) involving imports, exports, dealing in FRY-origin property, air and sea transportation, contract performance, funds transfers, activity promoting importation or exportation or dealings in property, and official sports, scientific, technical, or cultural representation of the FRY (S/M) in the United States.

Executive Order No. 12810 exempted from trade restrictions (1) transshipments through the FRY (S/M), and (2) activities related to the United Nations Protection Force ("UNPROFOR"), the Conference on

Yugoslavia, or the European Community Monitor Mission.

On January 15, 1993, President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12831 to implement new sanctions contained in United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 787 of November 16, 1992. The order revokes the exemption for transshipments through the FRY (S/M) contained in Executive Order No. 12810; prohibits transactions within the United States or by a U.S. person relating to FRY (S/M) vessels and vessels in which a majority or controlling interest is held by a person or entity in, or operating from, the FRY (S/M), and states that all such vessels shall be considered as vessels of the FRY (S/M), regardless of the flag under which they sail. Executive Order No. 12831 also delegates discretionary authority to the Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, to prohibit trade and financial transactions involving any areas of the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia as to which there is inadequate assurance that such transactions will not be diverted to the benefit of the FRY (S/M).

On April 26, 1993, I issued Executive Order No. 12846 to implement in the United States the sanctions adopted in United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 820 of April 17, 1993. That resolution called on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen peace plan for Bosnia-Herzegovina and, if they failed to do so by April 26, called on member states to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against the FRY (S/M) and Serbian-controlled areas of Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina.

Effective 12:01 a.m. e.d.t., April 26, 1993, Executive Order No. 12846: (1) blocks all property and interests in property of businesses organized or located in the FRY (S/M), including the property of their U.S. and other foreign subsidiaries, that are in or later come within the United States or the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches; (2) confirms the charging to the owners or operators of property blocked under this order or Executive Orders No. 12808, No. 12810, or No. 12831 all expenses incident to the blocking and maintenance of such property, requires that such expenses be satisfied from sources other than blocked funds, and permits such property to be sold and the proceeds (after payment of expenses) placed in a blocked account; (3) orders (a) the detention pending investigation of all nonblocked vessels, aircraft, freight vehicles, rolling stock, and cargo within the United States suspected of violating United Nations Security Council Resolutions No. 713, No. 757, No. 787, or No. 820, and (b) the blocking of such conveyances or cargo if a violation is determined to have been committed, and permits the liquidation of such

blocked conveyances or cargo and the placing of the proceeds into a blocked account; (4) prohibits any vessel registered in the United States, or owned or controlled by U.S. persons, other than U.S. naval vessels, from entering the territorial waters of the FRY (S/M); and (5) prohibits U.S. persons from engaging in any transactions relating to the shipment of goods to, from, or through United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia and areas in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces.

Executive Order No. 12846 authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State to take such actions, and to employ all powers granted to me by the authorities cited above, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of that order. The sanctions imposed in the order do not invalidate existing licenses or authorizations issued pursuant to Executive Orders No. 12808, No. 12810, or No. 12831 except as those licenses and authorizations may thereafter be terminated, suspended, or modified by the issuing Federal agencies, but otherwise the sanctions apply notwithstanding any preexisting contracts, international agreements, licenses, or authorizations.

2. The declaration of the national emergency on May 30, 1992, was made pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. The emergency declaration was reported to the Congress on May 30, 1992, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). The additional sanctions set forth in Executive Orders No. 12810, No. 12831, and No. 12846 were imposed pursuant to the authority vested in the President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including the statutes cited above, section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended (22 U.S.C. 287c).

3. Since the last report, the Office of Foreign Assets Control of the Department of the Treasury ("FAC"), in consultation with the Department of State and other Federal agencies, issued the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) Sanctions Regulations, 31 C.F.R. Part 585 (58 FR 13199, March 10, 1993—the "Regulations"), to implement the prohibitions contained in Executive Orders No. 12808, No. 12810, and No. 12831. A copy of the Regulations is enclosed with this report. The seven general licenses discussed in the last report were incorporated into the Regulations. The Regulations contain

general licenses for certain transactions incident to: the receipt or transmission of mail and informational materials and for telecommunications transmissions between the United States and the FRY (S/M); the importation and exportation of diplomatic pouches; certain transfers of funds or other financial or economic resources for the benefit of individuals located in the FRY (S/M); the importation and exportation of household and personal effects of persons arriving from or departing to the FRY (S/M); transactions related to nonbusiness travel by U.S. persons to, from, and within the FRY (S/M); and transactions involving secondary-market trading in debt obligations originally incurred by banks organized in Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Macedonia.

On January 15, 1993, FAC issued General Notice No. 2, entitled "Notification of Status of Yugoslav Entities." A copy of the notice is attached. The list is composed of government, financial, and commercial entities organized in Serbia or Montenegro and a number of foreign subsidiaries of such entities. The list is illustrative of entities covered by FAC's presumption, stated in the notice, that all entities organized or located in Serbia or Montenegro, as well as their foreign branches and subsidiaries, are controlled by the Government of the FRY (S/M) and thus subject to the blocking provisions of the Executive orders. General Notice No. 2, which includes more than 400 entities, expands and incorporates the list of 284 entities identified in General Notice No. 1 (57 FR 32051, July 20, 1992), noted in the previous report.

As part of a U.S.-led allied effort to tighten economic sanctions against Yugoslavia, on March 11, 1993, FAC named 25 maritime firms and 55 ships controlled by these firms as "Specially Designated Nationals" ("SDNs") of Yugoslavia. A copy of General Notice No. 3 is attached. These shipping firms and the vessels they own, manage, or operate by using foreign front companies, changing vessel names, and re-flagging ships, are presumed to be owned or controlled by or to be acting on behalf of the Government of the FRY (S/M). In addition, pursuant to Executive Order No. 12846, the property within U.S. jurisdiction of these firms is blocked as direct or indirect property interests of firms organized or located in the FRY (S/M).

The FRY (S/M) has continued to operate its maritime fleet and trade in violation of the international economic sanctions mandated by United Nations Security Council Resolutions No. 757 and No. 787. Operations and activities by Yugoslav front companies, or SDNs, enable the Government of the FRY (S/M) to circumvent the international trade embargo. The effect of FAC's SDN designation is to identify agents and property of the Government of the

FRY (S/M), and property of entities organized or located in the FRY (S/M), and thus to extend the applicability of the regulatory prohibitions governing transactions with the Government of the FRY (S/M) and its nationals by U.S. persons to these designated individuals and entities wherever located, irrespective of nationality or registration. U.S. persons are prohibited from engaging in any transaction involving property in which an SDN has an interest, which includes all financial and trade transactions. All SDN property within the jurisdiction of the United States (including financial assets in U.S. bank branches overseas) is blocked.

The two court cases in which the blocking authority was challenged as applied to FRY (S/M) subsidiaries and vessels in the United States remain pending at this time. In one case, the plaintiffs have challenged the application of Executive Order No. 12846, and the challenge remains to be resolved. The other case is presently pending before a U.S. Court of Appeals.

4. Over the past 6 months, the Departments of State and the Treasury have worked closely with European Community (the "EC") member states and other U.N. member nations to coordinate implementation of the sanctions against the FRY (S/M). This has included visits by assessment teams formed under the auspices of the United States, the EC, and the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (the "CSCE") to states bordering on Serbia and Montenegro; deployment of CSCE sanctions assistance missions ("SAMS") to Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Hungary, Romania, and Ukraine to assist in monitoring land and Danube River traffic; bilateral contacts between the United States and other countries with the purpose of tightening financial and trade restrictions on the FRY (S/M); and establishment of a mechanism to coordinate enforcement efforts and to exchange technical information.

5. In accordance with licensing policy and the Regulations, FAC has exercised its authority to license certain specific transactions with respect to the FRY (S/M) that are consistent with the Security Council sanctions. During the reporting period, FAC has issued 163 specific licenses regarding transactions pertaining to the FRY (S/M) or assets it owns or controls, bringing the total as of April 30, 1993, to 426. Specific licenses have been issued for (1) payment to U.S. or third-country secured creditors, under certain narrowly defined circumstances, for pre-embargo import and export transactions; (2) for legal representation or advice to the Government of the FRY (S/M) or FRY (S/M)-controlled clients; (3) for restricted and closely monitored operations by subsidiaries of FRY (S/M)-controlled firms

located in the United States; (4) for limited FRY (S/M) diplomatic representation in Washington and New York; (5) for patent, trademark and copyright protection, and maintenance transactions in the FRY (S/M) not involving payment to the FRY (S/M) Government; (6) for certain communications, news media, and travel-related transactions; (7) for the payment of crews' wages and vessel maintenance of FRY (S/M)-controlled ships blocked in the United States; (8) for the removal from the FRY (S/M) of manufactured property owned and controlled by U.S. entities; and (9) to assist the United Nations in its relief operations and the activities of the U.N. Protection Force. Pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions No. 757 and No. 760, specific licenses have also been issued to authorize exportation of food, medicine, and supplies intended for humanitarian purposes in the FRY (S/M).

During the past 6 months, FAC has continued to closely monitor 15 U.S. subsidiaries of entities organized in the FRY (S/M) that were blocked as entities owned or controlled by the Government of the FRY (S/M). Treasury agents performed on-site audits and reviewed numerous reports submitted by the blocked subsidiaries. Subsequent to the issuance of Executive Order No. 12846, operating licenses issued for U.S.-located Serbian or Montenegrin subsidiaries or joint ventures were revoked and the U.S. entities closed for business.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board and the New York State Banking Department again worked closely with FAC with regard to two Serbian banking institutions in New York that were closed on June 1, 1992. Full-time bank examiners continue to be posted in their offices to ensure that banking records are appropriately safeguarded.

During the past 6 months, U.S. financial institutions have continued to block funds transfers in which there is an interest of the Government of the FRY (S/M). Such transfers have accounted for an additional \$24.5 million in blocked Yugoslav assets since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12808.

To ensure compliance with the terms of the licenses that have been issued under the program, stringent reporting requirements are imposed. Some 350 submissions were reviewed since the last report, and more than 150 compliance cases are currently open. In addition, licensed bank accounts are regularly audited by FAC compliance personnel and by cooperating auditors from other regulatory agencies.

6. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12810, FAC has worked closely with the U.S. Customs Service to ensure both that prohibited imports and exports (including those in which the Government of the FRY (S/M) has an interest) are identified and interdicted,

and that permitted imports and exports move to their intended destination without undue delay. Violations and suspected violations of the embargo are being investigated, and appropriate enforcement actions are being taken. There are currently 39 cases under active investigation.

7. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from December 1, 1992, through May 30, 1993, that are directly attributable to the authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to the FRY (S/M) are estimated at \$2.9 million, most of which represent wage and salary costs for Federal personnel. Personnel costs were largely centered in the Department of the Treasury (particularly in FAC and its Chief Counsel's Office and the U.S. Customs Service), the Department of State, the National Security Council, the U.S. Coast Guard, and the Department of Commerce.

8. The actions and policies of the Government of the FRY (S/M), in its involvement in and support for groups attempting to seize and hold territory in Croatia and Bosnia-Herzegovina by force and violence, continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. The United States remains committed to a multilateral resolution of this crisis through its actions implementing the binding resolutions of the United Nations Security Council with respect to the FRY (S/M). I shall continue to exercise the powers at my disposal to apply economic sanctions against the FRY (S/M) as long as these measures are appropriate, and will continue to report periodically to the Congress on significant developments pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 25, 1993.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SERGEANT AT ARMS OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Sergeant at Arms of the House:

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 24, 1993.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that I have received subpoenas for grand juries issued to an employee of the Office of the Sergeant at Arms by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I will make the determinations required by the Rule.

Sincerely,

WERNER W. BRANDT,
Sergeant at Arms.

RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 173 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 45.

□ 1423

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia, with Mr. DARDEN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title for the Senate joint resolution.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, May 20, 1993, all time for general debate had expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the joint resolution is considered as an original joint resolution for the purpose of amendment and is considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

S.J. RES. 45

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Resolution Authorizing the Use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia".

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) An estimated 300,000 Somalis have died as a result of hunger and widespread violence since the fall of Siad Barre in January 1991.

(2) On December 3, 1992, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 794 in which the Security Council—

(A) determined that "the magnitude of the human tragedy caused by the conflict in Somalia, further exacerbated by the obstacles being created to the distribution of humanitarian assistance, constitutes a threat to international peace and security", and

(B) acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, authorized the use of "all necessary means to establish as soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia".

(3) United States Armed Forces entered Somalia on December 9, 1992, in response to Security Council Resolution 794.

(4) The United Nations Secretary General concluded in his report of March 3, 1993, that without improved security throughout Somalia "the political process cannot prosper and humanitarian relief operations will remain vulnerable to disruption".

(5) The Secretary General recommended in his report that the United Nations Security Council adopt a resolution effecting the transition from the United States-led force in Somalia to a United Nations-led force, with the formal date of transfer of command to be May 1, 1993.

(6) The Secretary General's report envisioned a United Nations-led force having a multinational military component of 20,000 personnel, plus an additional 8,000 personnel to provide logistic support.

(7) On March 26, 1993, the United Nations Security Council, acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted Resolution 814 in response to the Secretary General's report. This resolution provides for the establishment of the United Nations-led force in Somalia by expanding the size and mandate of the original United Nations peacekeeping force in Somalia (commonly referred to as "UNOSOM") in accordance with the recommendations contained in the report of the Secretary General.

(8) United States Armed Forces will participate in the United Nations-led force in Somalia as part of the multinational logistic support contingent, providing logistical, communications, and intelligence support.

(9) In addition to logistic forces, the United States will make available a battalion-sized tactical quick reaction force to respond to requests for emergency assistance from the United Nations Force Commander in Somalia. This quick reaction force will be under United States operational control.

(10) The transfer of operations in Somalia from the United States-led force to the United Nations-led force will result in a substantial reduction in the number of members of the United States Armed Forces that are deployed in Somalia and in the costs incurred by the United States as a result of United Nations-authorized operations in Somalia.

(11) The Congress should authorize any use of United States Armed Forces to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 and 814.

(12) By providing such an authorization, the Congress will facilitate the transfer of operations in Somalia from the United States-led force to the United Nations-led force.

(13)(A) The Congress does not anticipate that United States Armed Forces will need to remain in Somalia for more than 12 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution to implement United Nations Security Council Resolution 814.

(B) Given the importance of the mission of the United Nations-led force in Somalia, however, the Congress will give strong consideration to extending the authorization for the use of United States Armed Forces to implement Resolution 814 should such continued use be necessary to ensure the success of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

SEC. 3. SUPPORT FOR UNITED NATIONS EFFORTS IN SOMALIA.

The Congress supports United Nations efforts in Somalia—

(1) to help provide a secure environment for famine relief efforts;

(2) to prevent a resumption of violence;

(3) to help restore peace, stability, and order through reconciliation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of Somali society; and

(4) to help the people of Somalia create and maintain democratic institutions for their own governance.

SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF ARMED FORCES.

(a) IMPLEMENTATION OF SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS.—The President is authorized to use United States Armed Forces to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 (1992) and 814 (1993), including the use of such Armed Forces—

(1) to carry out operations under the authorization provided by United Nations Security Council Resolution 794 (1992) until the

transition to the United Nations-led force in Somalia is completed;

(2) to provide logistic and related support for the United Nations-led force in Somalia under the authorization provided by United Nations Security Council Resolution 814 (1993); and

(3) to serve as a tactical quick reaction force, under United States operational control, to respond to requests for emergency assistance from the United Nations Force Commander in Somalia.

(b) STATEMENTS OF INTENT REQUIRED BY WAR POWERS RESOLUTION.—Consistent with section 8(a)(1) of the War Powers Resolution, the Congress declares that subsection (a) is intended to constitute specific statutory authorization within the meaning of section 5(b) of the War Powers Resolution to the extent that any United States Armed Forces being used for the purposes described in subsection (a) are or become involved in hostilities or situations where imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances.

(c) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORIZATIONS.—The authorizations provided by subsection (a) shall expire at the earlier of—

(1) the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution, unless the Congress finds that continued participation by the United States Armed Forces is necessary to ensure the success of the United Nations-led force in Somalia and extends the period of such authorizations; or

(2) the expiration of the mandate of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

SEC. 5. REPORTS REGARDING USE OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) PERIODIC REPORTS.—

(1) INFORMATION TO BE PROVIDED.—The President shall submit periodic reports to the Congress with respect to United States Armed Forces participation in and support for the United Nations-led force in Somalia. Each such report shall—

(A) specify the number of members of the United States Armed Forces participating in the United Nations-led force in Somalia or operating in support of that force;

(B) specify where United States Armed Forces are deployed as part of the United Nations-led force in Somalia and where United States Armed Forces are deployed that are operating in support of that force;

(C) specify the functions being performed by United States Armed Forces participating in the United Nations-led force in Somalia;

(D) specify the functions of United States Armed Forces operating as a tactical quick reaction force in support of the United Nations-led force in Somalia, and describe any use of United States Armed Forces as a quick reaction force;

(E) specify the command arrangements applicable with respect to United States Armed Forces participating in the United Nations-led force in Somalia or operating in support of that force; and

(F) specify the anticipated duration of the deployment of United States Armed Forces as part of the United Nations-led force in Somalia or in support of that force.

(2) REPORTING DATES AND PERIOD COVERED BY EACH REPORT.—A report pursuant to this subsection shall be submitted—

(A) not later than July 1, 1993, covering the period since March 3, 1993; and

(B) not later than July 1, 1994, covering the period since the preceding report pursuant to this subsection.

(3) WAR POWERS RESOLUTION REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—The requirements of this sub-

section do not supersede the requirements of section 4 of the War Powers Resolution.

(b) REPORT ON TRANSITION TO UN-LED FORCE.—The first report submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall specify the number of members of the United States Armed Forces, if any, remaining in Somalia as part of the United States-led force in Somalia.

(c) AGREEMENTS WITH UNITED NATIONS.—The President shall transmit promptly to the Congress a copy of any memorandum of understanding or other written agreement entered into by the United States with the United Nations Security Council, the Secretary General of the United Nations (or his Special Representative), or the United Nations Force Commander in Somalia—

(1) regarding the participation of United States Armed Forces in the United Nations-led force in Somalia;

(2) regarding United States Armed Forces operating as a tactical quick reaction force in support of that force or otherwise in support of that force; or

(3) otherwise regarding the availability to the United Nations Security Council of United States Armed Forces, assistance, or facilities to implement Security Council Resolution 794 or 814.

SEC. 6. REPORTS ON COSTS OF UNITED NATIONS-AUTHORIZED OPERATIONS IN SOMALIA.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR PERIODIC REPORTS.—The President shall submit to the Congress periodic reports regarding the costs of the United States-led force in Somalia and the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

(b) INFORMATION ON COSTS AND OTHER CONTRIBUTIONS.—Each report pursuant to this section shall specify (to the extent such information is available to the United States)—

(1) the amount of the incremental costs incurred by the United States as the result of its participation in the United States-led force in Somalia or as the result of its participation in or military operations in support of the United Nations-led force in Somalia;

(2) the amount of other in-kind or financial contributions pledged, and the amount of such contributions made, by each participating country toward the costs associated with the United States-led force in Somalia and the United Nations-led force in Somalia, including contributions to the United Nations Trust Fund for Somalia and excluding amounts reported pursuant to paragraph (3);

(3) the amount assessed by the United Nations to the United States and each other country for its contributions to the costs associated with the United Nations-led force in Somalia;

(4) the amount received by the United States and each other country as reimbursement from the United Nations, including reimbursements from the United Nations Trust Fund for Somalia, as the result of its participation in the United States-led force in Somalia; and

(5) the amount received by the United States and each other country as credit against an assessment described in paragraph (3) from the United Nations for costs that it incurred as the result of its participation in or military operations in support of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

(c) REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE UNITED STATES IN SOMALIA.—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should seek to ensure that incremental costs incurred by the United States in connection with the United States-led force in Somalia and in connection with the United Nations-

led force in Somalia are reimbursed to the maximum extent possible by the United Nations and other members of the international community. Each report pursuant to this section shall review all actions taken by the United States to achieve this objective.

(d) REPORTING DATES AND PERIOD COVERED BY EACH REPORT.—A report pursuant to this section shall be submitted—

(1) not later than 1 month after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, covering the period ending on the last day of the penultimate month preceding the enactment of this joint resolution; and

(2) not later than 12 months and 24 months after that date, covering the 12-month period following the period covered by the preceding report pursuant to this section and also providing cumulative information.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution—

(1) the term "United Nations Force Commander in Somalia" means the commander appointed by the Secretary General of the United Nations to command the United Nations-led force in Somalia;

(2) the term "United Nations-led force in Somalia" means the expanded force (commonly referred to as "UNOSOM II") authorized by paragraph 5 of United Nations Security Council Resolution 814 (1993);

(3) the term "United Nations Trust Fund for Somalia" means the trust fund established and maintained pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 and 814; and

(4) the term "United States-led force in Somalia" means the force (commonly referred to as the "Unified Task Force" or "UNITAF") authorized by United Nations Security Council Resolution 794 (1992).

Amend the title so as to read: "Joint Resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 (1992) and 814 (1993)."

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the substitute is in order except those amendments printed in House Report 103-97. Each amendment shall be considered in the order printed, may be offered only by the named proponent or a designee, shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, except that pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate may be offered by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question. Debate on each amendment shall be equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment.

The Chair will announce the number of the amendment made in order by the rule in order to give notice to the Committee of the Whole as to the order of recognition.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 103-97.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HAMILTON

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 173, I offer a technical amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HAMILTON:
Page 9, strike out lines 7 through 10.
Page 9, line 11, strike out "(13)" and insert in lieu thereof "(12)".
Page 10, strike out lines 20 through 23.
Page 10, line 24, strike out "(2)" and insert in lieu thereof "(1)".
Page 11, line 3, strike out "(3)" and insert in lieu thereof "(2)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment makes two technical changes in Senate Joint Resolution 45, as reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Both changes are intended to update the resolution.

□ 1430

Both changes, so far as I know, are noncontroversial. They are intended to update the resolution to reflect the transfer of administrative and operational control of the Somalia operation to the U.N.-led forces from the United States-led forces.

The amendment strikes finding (12), which states that—

Congress will facilitate the transfer of operations in Somalia from the United States-led force to the United Nations-led force.

That transfer is now complete, so the finding is no longer necessary.

The amendment also strikes in the authorization section the description of the use of U.S. forces "to carry out operations under the authorization provided by U.N. Security Council Resolution 794 until the transition to the U.N.-led force is completed;"

Again, that transition has been completed.

In summary then, this amendment makes two small technical changes to ensure that Senate Joint Resolution 45 is current and accurate and up to date.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I do not have any objection, I do want to state that I support the technical amendments offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

As the gentleman indicated, the amendment makes technical changes to Senate Joint Resolution 45. These changes revise the resolution to take account of developments on the ground in Somalia since the passage of the resolution in committee on May 5, 1993.

Mr. Chairman, we have no objection and I urge all Members to support the technical amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 103-97.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] rise?

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE
OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. GILMAN:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This joint resolution may be cited as the "Authorization for Use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia Resolution".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) an estimated 300,000 Somalis reportedly have died of hunger or as casualties of widespread violence since the fall of Siad Barre in January, 1991;

(2) international relief agencies were unable to deliver adequate assistance to those most in need due to increasingly difficult and dangerous security conditions, including pervasive banditry and looting;

(3) the Congress expressed its support for a greater United Nations role in addressing the political and humanitarian situation in Somalia through Senate Concurrent Resolution 132 and House Concurrent Resolution 370 of the 102d Congress;

(4) the United Nations Secretary General and United States officials concluded that intervention in Somalia would be necessary to avert further massive starvation;

(5) the United Nations Security Council on December 3, 1992, adopted Resolution 794, authorizing the use of "all necessary means to establish as soon as possible a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia";

(6) President Bush on December 8, 1992, began deploying United States Armed Forces in Somalia in response to United Nations Security Council Resolution 794;

(7) on December 10, 1992, President Bush formally reported to the Congress on the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Somalia;

(8) on January 15, 1993, the Department of Defense announced the beginning of the withdrawal of United States Armed Forces from Somalia;

(9) as of mid-May 1993, approximately 3,800 American servicemen and women remain in and near Somalia;

(10) President Bush emphasized that United States Armed Forces would be withdrawn from Somalia and that the security mission would be assumed by a new United Nations peace-keeping operation (UNOSOM II) as soon as a "secure environment" was created for the delivery of food and other humanitarian assistance;

(11) the deployment of United States Armed Forces in Somalia, together with

those from other countries, has led to a substantial increase in the delivery of humanitarian assistance and has opened up access to more remote areas of the country;

(12) further starvation on a massive scale has been averted in Somalia, but there remains a need for continuing humanitarian efforts under UNOSOM II;

(13) in a report dated March 3, 1993, the United Nations Secretary General proposed that the transfer of command from UNITAF to UNOSOM II take place on May 1, 1993;

(14) on March 26, 1993, the United Nations Security Council adopted Resolution 814, approving the Secretary General's report of March 3, 1993;

(15) pursuant to Resolution 814, United States Armed Forces will play a key role in the UNOSOM II operation, United States Armed Forces participating in UNOSOM II will be under the command of a United Nations official, and United States Armed Forces participating in UNOSOM II will be asked to fulfill a mission in Somalia that is much broader and more open-ended than the mission originally outlined by President Bush;

(16) United States Armed Forces in Somalia are not now in a situation of hostilities or a situation in which imminent involvement in hostilities is clearly indicated by the circumstances within the meaning of the War Powers Resolution, nor is it contemplated that they will be in such a situation while participating in UNOSOM II; and

(17) the Congress has not been adequately consulted on the new United Nations mission in Somalia and has not had an opportunity to debate and consider what United States policy should be in the context of a broadened United Nations mandate for that country.

SEC. 3. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) prior to United Nations-authorized operations in Somalia, over 300,000 Somalis (including one-fourth of the children under the age of five) died due to civil strife, disease, and famine, and at least one-half of Somalia's population of 8,000,000 people, were considered at risk of starvation;

(2) the number of deaths from starvation in Somalia has declined significantly since the arrival of the United States-led force in Somalia; and

(3) the United States contributed immeasurably to UNITAF, including the deployment of over 20,000 members of the Armed Forces and the loss of American lives.

(b) COMMENDATION OF U.S. ARMED FORCES.—The Congress commends the United States Armed Forces for successfully establishing a secure environment for the humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

SEC. 4. PARTICIPATION OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN UNOSOM II.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to deploy United States Armed Forces in Somalia in order to participate in UNOSOM II, subject to subsection (b).

(b) EXPIRATION.—The authorization provided in subsection (a) shall expire 6 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution, unless Congress extends such authorization.

SEC. 5. CONGRESSIONAL POLICY STATEMENTS.

(a) RESTORATION OF SOMALI SELF-GOVERNMENT AND WITHDRAWAL OF FOREIGN MILITARY FORCES.—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the restoration of self-government to Somalia and the withdrawal of all foreign military forces from Somalia at the earliest

date consistent with the humanitarian situation in that country are fundamental objectives of the international community;

(2) to achieve these objectives, the United Nations should foster the establishment of competent local authorities in Somalia that will enable the Somali people to reclaim control of their country; and

(3) the size and scope of UNOSOM II should be reduced as quickly as local institutions and the humanitarian situation will permit.

(b) **WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.**—It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) United States Armed Forces have performed a humanitarian service in Somalia that the armed forces of very few other countries could have performed;

(2) increasingly, however, the security needs of Somalia can be handled by the armed forces of other countries; and

(3) the mission of UNOSOM II established by United Nations Security Council Resolution 814 is considerably broader than the original United States objective of creating a secure environment for the delivery of humanitarian assistance.

For these reasons, and consistent with the objectives of promptly restoring Somalia self-government and withdrawing foreign military forces from Somalia, the Congress declares that all United States Armed Forces should be withdrawn from Somalia not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and their functions assumed by other UNOSOM II personnel or forces to the extent required after that date.

(c) **REIMBURSEMENT OF COSTS INCURRED BY THE UNITED STATES IN SOMALIA.**—It is the sense of the Congress that the President should seek to ensure that incremental costs incurred by the United States in connection with UNITAF and in connection with UNOSOM II are reimbursed to the maximum extent possible by the United Nations and other members of the international community.

SEC. 6. REPORTING REQUIREMENT.

Not later than 2 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution and at least once every 2 months thereafter until 2 months after all United States Armed Forces have been withdrawn from Somalia, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on developments related to Somalia. Each such report shall include—

(1) a statement of United States policy objectives in Somalia and an assessment of the progress that has been made in achieving those objectives;

(2) an assessment of the progress that has been made in fostering the establishment of competent local authorities in Somalia;

(3) the projected date for withdrawal of all United States Armed Forces from Somalia and an assessment of the progress that has been made toward completing that withdrawal;

(4) a full accounting of all United States incremental costs in connection with UNITAF and UNOSOM II;

(5) a full accounting of the estimated incremental costs of other countries in connection with UNITAF and UNOSOM II;

(6) a full accounting of all contributions that have been made to the United Nations Somalia Trust Fund, and all disbursements from the Fund; and

(7) a statement of the steps that have been taken, and an assessment of the progress that has been achieved, in obtaining reimbursement of the incremental costs incurred by the United States in connection with UNITAF and UNOSOM II.

SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this joint resolution—

(1) the term "UNITAF" means the Unified Task Force established pursuant to United Nations Security Council Resolution 794 (1992); and

(2) the term "UNOSOM II" means the international force established pursuant to the United Nations Security Council Resolution 814 (1993).

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is rare when there is disagreement within the Committee on Foreign Affairs on a foreign policy issue such as the one facing us today. We have a long, bipartisan tradition in the committee, especially in regard to emergency humanitarian crises around the world.

However, in the case of Somalia, I find myself in strong opposition to the provision of Senate Joint Resolution 45 that is very likely to provide for a long-term deployment of U.S. troops in a U.N. mission where the mission was neither debated nor approved by the Congress. And I want to make clear that my opposition is not a partisan opposition but is rather based on a fundamental difference of opinion on an important foreign policy issue.

The United States did not sign on to a plan for the national reconstruction of Somali society and the disarming of every Somali when we sent our forces there to restore order and confront the urgent humanitarian crisis. We have done our part and have done it effectively. Order has been restored, food is being delivered, and a U.N. force is now in place. It is time now for U.S. forces to come home. The United Nations has more than ample forces at its disposal to carry out its reconstruction plans.

Virtually all of us agree that United States military forces in Somalia have fulfilled the mission outlined for them by President Bush. My substitute authorizes their continued presence in Somalia for a 6-month transitional period and clearly states that all United States Armed Forces should be withdrawn from Somalia at the end of that 6-month period.

In contrast, the authorization in Senate Joint Resolution 45 runs for 12 months after the date of enactment. In addition, the Hamilton resolution strongly implies that the authorization will be extended as long as the United Nations wants. Because there is every reason to believe that the United Nations is planning to keep our forces in Somalia for a long time—perhaps as long as a decade—I urge my colleagues to think carefully before rejecting the limited authorization in my substitute

with no presumption of renewal in favor of the longer authorization in Senate Joint Resolution 45 with a presumption of renewal.

My substitute authorizes the deployment of United States Armed Forces to Somalia to engage in peacekeeping only. If "hostilities"—as defined by the war powers resolution—were to break out, relevant provisions of that resolution would require the President to obtain additional authorization from Congress for our Armed Forces to remain in that country for more than 60 days.

By contrast, Senate Joint Resolution 45 provides "specific statutory authorization" under the war powers resolution for the deployment of United States Armed Forces to Somalia. This means that if hostilities break out in Somalia, the President could keep our troops in that country with no further authorization from Congress. The administration has not requested such authorization and considers it unnecessary. Why give the administration a war powers blank check when it is not even asking for one?

The transitional six-month period for the withdrawal of our Armed Forces that my substitute provides would let our commanders in the field draw down our logistical forces in a careful and deliberate way, and would enable them to send our Quick Reaction Force back to its home base.

It is also important for Members to understand that over the past 5 years, 12 new U.N. peacekeeping operations have been undertaken to end regional and national conflicts, monitor cease-fires, and help rebuild shattered societies. Seven of these were begun in 1992 alone. What we do in Somalia could well become the model for United States intervention in the many emerging hot spots around the world.

We have done more than our fair share in Somalia. With new peacekeeping operations demanding additional resources and commitments from the United States, we need to begin to set realistic and feasible limits on our humanitarian commitments around the world.

In short, my substitute is more forward-leaning in requiring the administration to protect the interests of the American taxpayer, in minimizing the risks to our Armed Forces in Somalia, and in protecting the rights of the Congress to authorize all aspects of our involvement in that country. For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished

gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the committee for yielding me this time.

I want to commend him for his legislation.

I rise respectfully, but most strongly in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

□ 1440

I would like to put this whole discussion and the two alternatives in a broader context. With the end of the cold war, with the end of the confrontation between the Soviet bloc and our forces, we face a whole new international security situation, and in instance after instance we will find that American interests are best protected when we are part of the action of a multilateral nature with the bulk of the burden and the bulk of the cost borne by others. When President Bush decided to deploy United States forces in Somalia, all of the costs and all of the forces were American, and where we stand today is that the bulk of the forces are not American, and the bulk of the costs are borne by other nations. I would think the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] would welcome this shift. As a matter of fact, wherever we look, currently or prospectively, there will be international crises where we will have to play a role. I hope it will be a relatively minor role with the bulk of the activity undertaken by other forces. But it would be the height of irresponsibility, and absurdity and stupidity to withdraw American forces before the job is done.

We now have about 10 percent of the forces in Somalia, including 1,300 United States forces, a Quick Reaction Force. That is insurance. That is there to see to it that, should hostilities flair up, there is a capable force nipping it in the bud and dealing with it. To set an arbitrarily short time period, and the gentleman from New York knows this as well as I do, that the Somalia crisis will not be resolved in 6 months, it is obvious that it will not be resolved in 6 months; and, if we now telegraph a message that in 6 months we are out, that means that the effort, and the time and, yes, the sacrifices of American forces which have been killed in the process of this undertaking, will have been in vain.

We must indicate some degree of stability. We must indicate some degree of perseverance. The Hamilton legislation calls for a year. I hope the Somalia project will be concluded in a year. But there is not a Member in this body who thinks that in 6 months time this thing will be sealed, signed, and delivered.

I would also like to take issue with a rather important aspect of the substitute offered by my very good friend,

the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. This undertaking was begun by a Republican President, and I, for one, supported him when he decided to undertake the Somalia operation. It was continued by a Democrat President, and I support him for continuing the policy begun by a Republican President. I simply cannot understand how the gentleman in his substitute specifically praises the Republican President and implicitly criticizes the Democrat President for undertaking the same international humanitarian mission.

I think it is important for us to recognize that whenever possible we should stand together in these international crises, from Bosnia to Somalia, and there will be many more as we look ahead over the years and over the decades. It is a pity to reduce this to partisan bickering. It would seem to me that we either ought to praise both of our Presidents who supported this action or we should single out neither.

Mr. Chairman, the Hamilton proposal does the latter, and I think it is important that it prevail because it would be very unfortunate if such an issue, which has had the bipartisan support of the American people and of this body, should descend into partisan bickering.

I would also like to suggest that while my colleagues will speak at length about the relevance of the war powers resolution, I would just make one simple point about it:

There has long been debate between the executive and legislative branches on the question of shared responsibilities for major foreign policy decisions. I firmly believe, Mr. Chairman, that constitutional principles make it clear that decision making on sending U.S. troops abroad for potential combat must be shared by the executive and legislative branches. For this reason I think it is important to rely on specific statutory authority such as that provided by the war powers resolution, which the Hamilton proposal does include and the Gilman proposal does not.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about reporting requirements. I find it amusing that the side that typically talks about excessive bureaucratic procedures is calling for reporting every 2 months on a variety of factors. Chairman HAMILTON's legislation requires reporting on the full range of issues, but reports are necessary only initially and in 12 months time so as to avoid placing unduly burdensome bureaucratic and onerous tasks on those who should be focusing, not on providing bimonthly reports to this body, but should be focusing on carrying out policy.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] has expired and the gentleman has no time to yield.

Mr. LANTOS. I, therefore, Mr. Chairman, yield back the balance of my non-existing time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mrs. MEYERS], a member of our committee.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Gilman substitute. Now that the mission ordered by President Bush in Operation Restore Hope has been completed, all American forces should be withdrawn from Somalia as quickly as possible. Failure to do so will condemn our forces to a deployment that will last for years. American troops will be continuously dying in support of an impossible mission.

The objective the United Nations has established for UNOSOM II is that of disarming the rival factions, beginning long-term development and nation-building activities, and engaging in national reconciliation. Let me emphasize again, long term. The most optimistic observers say this task will take through the end of the century. If Congress is to state that strong consideration will be given to extending the authorization for American forces in Somalia should they continue to be needed, it is as certain as the sun rising in the East that the United Nations will say they will still be needed for as long as this mission lasts.

However, the United Nations is simply not capable of accomplishing this mission, not by the end of this century or the end of the next century. They will try to broker a deal between the rival clans and install a democratic system over the traditional Somali culture.

Some members of President Bush's National Security Council staff were advocating that this be part of the mission of Operation Restore Hope. General Powell convinced President Bush that this was a bad idea. Now, it appears President Clinton has decided that America should accept this mission under U.N. command. I have no reason to question the ability of General Bir to run the peacekeeping forces in Somalia, but I am not as confident about the ability of his bureaucratic superiors in New York.

Finally, I am seriously concerned about the war powers authorization contained in the bill. Other peacekeeping operations that involved American troops have not required such an authorization. The "Dear Colleague" signed by Messrs. HAMILTON, LANTOS, and JOHNSTON says Senate Joint Resolution 45 grants the same type of prior authorization under the war powers resolution as Congress approved for Operation Desert Storm. That makes our point as to why there should not be this authorization in this bill. Operation Desert Storm was a full-scale war. Yes, we found that war powers language acceptable for what President

Bush wanted to do in the gulf war. Operation Desert Storm had a clearly defined mission, one that could be accomplished in a relatively short time. UNOSOM II's mission is not clearly defined. It will take years, perhaps generations to achieve Somali national reconciliation, whatever that may be. Do my colleagues actually want to authorize that kind of commitment for American troops in Somalia? Under the command of, not Americans, but rather the United Nations? Also, remember that it was George Bush who decided when Operation Desert Storm had accomplished its mission. In this case it will be U.N. officials, who have absolutely no accountability to the American people, who will have the authority to decide whether and when our forces had accomplished their mission.

I believe that to grant this authority would be a serious mistake. Please join me in supporting the Gilman substitute.

□ 1450

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI], a subcommittee chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Chairman, there are always foreign policy issues that for one reason or another will divide us, different priorities or views of the world, costs or ideological divisions. But surely here is one foreign policy issue upon which we can all agree: A desperate people in a poor land are driven to mass starvation by feudal warlords, and the world responds. Hundreds of thousands of lives are saved simply by opening the roads so that food can be delivered and order is established.

Among the many proud chapters of the United States and our Armed Forces, surely this must rank among them. And of the good leadership that George Bush provided in foreign policy, this, too, must be listed.

It is part of what makes America unique. Many countries would respond to opportunities to gain great wealth, conquer new lands, gain new glories. But what other nation than ours would send their sons and daughters halfway around the globe to ensure that food could be delivered, order restored, and then bring our forces home?

Indeed, our pride in our country for this selfless act can only be surpassed by our pride in our Armed Forces, 25,000 soldiers, professionally, selflessly, giving months of their lives in what they have often termed the best experience of their lives.

Now it is our responsibility to bring their efforts to a successful conclusion, to consolidate their victory over feudalism and hunger. And that is the message of this resolution. If the warlords doubt our power to remain, to see in fact this consolidation of victory,

they will wait us out, no matter the time, and we will find again the same genocide by hunger that we saw before.

This 12-month authorization is what is needed as a message to them that we did not sacrifice in lives or treasure or efforts only to have them steal again the future of their people.

But it also provides cover of law in the War Powers Act. For all the frustration with the War Powers Act, for all those who have opposed it, it is still in my belief the greatest constitutional contribution of this generation to American law. It builds upon the frustrations of division in American foreign policy by assuring that no matter how small the battle, when American soldiers are placed in harm's way, this country will be united, the institutions of this Government will be together, and there will be support by the American people to bring an ultimate victory.

This resolution offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] ensures that cover of law for Somalia, and more. It sets a precedent. For while most Members of this House may agree today with what happened in Somalia, there is no assurance in the future that every time a President sends our forces to harm's way we will agree again. But by preserving our prerogatives in this House, by exercising the powers of the War Powers Act, we set an important precedent for the future.

But still, despite the importance of law and the significant contribution we have made to humanity, there are those who will disagree. There are those who will argue that the United States is being a policeman.

But indeed, if you cede the point, for what better cause? Only we have the power and the means to bring the world together. If we are going to err on the side of being a policeman, this was the time to err.

There are those who will argue cost, but indeed there are only 2,700 troops that remain, and indeed the financial obligation is only 10 percent of the total cost.

I ask my colleagues to support this resolution because it is the right message to the warlords, that we will not be tried out in our patience, because it honors our forces, because it preserves the prerogatives of this House and sets a precedent for the future.

When George Bush decided to send our forces to Somalia, we responded. Now Bill Clinton has asked that we complete the job that George Bush began. He deserves no less. Defeat the amendment and support the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE], a member of our committee.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is any criticism of the present administration in the well-crafted amendment of the gentleman

from New York [Mr. GILMAN]. I think there is recognition that the character of this mission has changed.

When our troops were sent over there it was to stabilize a country where people were starving, where food was not getting to them, and it was to assist in getting food to women and children and people in the rural areas of Somalia that, because the warlords were at each other's throats, were not able to survive.

Now, that was an in and out, a short term, get over there and do what is necessary, get the starvation level eliminated, and then for a more permanent solution, leave it to the United Nations, leave it to the Organization of African Unity, leave it to the other people.

We, after all, if we are to continue to perform this function, we ought to visit the Sudan, we ought to look at Liberia. Angola is still very explosive. Rwanda is still enduring tribes killing other tribes. Mozambique is still under fire with Renamo and other rebel groups still active. So there is no shortage of places for us to bring our troops to perform a stabilization function.

The difficulty with the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is it presents the administration with authority it has not asked for, and it says you can stay there for 12 months, thus taking Congress totally out of play. Congress cannot do other than respect the law if this becomes law. It is a recognition, a reaffirmation of the War Powers Act.

Only twice in our history has Congress acted under the War Powers Act: once when we sent marines to Lebanon, and the other time was Desert Storm. That should be a very solemn undertaking. Here our soldiers are not in hostility nor in imminent danger of hostility.

Now, one could define that liberally if you wish, and one can walk through the District of Columbia or the city of Chicago and say you are in danger of imminent hostility. But I think the situation in Somalia is not that which is contemplated by the War Powers Act where you are going to get in harm's way imminently or you are already in harm's way.

□ 1500

This is not so. And so we do not need what the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is offering. The administration has not asked for it, and we ought not to trivialize the solemn undertaking of providing statutory authority for the Commander in Chief to exercise his constitutional powers as Commander in Chief. I just do not think this situation calls for that.

Now, the Organization of African Unity, it is quite interesting, Botswana is going to contribute 200 soldiers to this U.N. troop. Egypt, which gets \$1.2

billion a year in military assistance and \$800 million a year in economic support funds, is going to contribute 615 soldiers. Wow. And they are in the neighborhood with Somalia, I would remind my colleagues.

We also have Namibia with 196. They are likely to contribute that. Nigeria, 562; Uganda, 300; Zambia, 500; Zimbabwe, they are the biggest player there, they will provide 912 soldiers to this U.N. force.

Now, the U.S. contribution to this force is 3,800—not what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. TORRICELLI] has said, 2,700 plus 1,300 marines in a rapid reaction force, not under U.N. command but in the neighborhood.

Now, under the bill of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], we will be there 12 months, authority to keep our troops there. That is not what George Bush had in mind. We will be there as the biggest force, whereas Egypt and the other countries over there that get, I might add, a lot of money from the international financial institutions as well as bilateral aid, will be contributing a fraction of what the United States does.

What happened to burdensharing? Where is the money going to come from? We are going to take it from the military budget, the defense budget, operations and maintenance. We are going to further emasculate and eviscerate our defense establishment to pay for this.

It is not necessary. It is not required. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] provides a 6-month time period. I do not like any time limit period. I think the President has the authority, as Commander in Chief, to send the troops there. If we do not like it, we can pass a bill withholding funds for that operation.

Meanwhile, he is the Commander in Chief. We do not need the Hamilton amendment. Gilman is infinitely superior.

I ask that my colleagues support Gilman.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. McCURDY].

Mr. McCURDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 45, the joint resolution authorizing U.S. Armed Forces to support U.N. operations in Somalia and to oppose alternatives or amendments that would mandate unreasonable deadlines for a U.S. withdrawal.

Our efforts in Somalia have been a resounding success. U.S. forces have ended the civil war, reestablished order, and saved millions of innocent people from starvation. Operation Restore Hope will serve as a source of pride to the American people and the U.S. military, and a ray of hope to impoverished people around the world. It is a prime example of the good U.S.

Armed Forces can do in the post-cold-war era.

Now, as we planned from the beginning, primary responsibility for peace in Somalia is being transferred to the United Nations. It, and not the United States, will bear the primary burden of the continuing U.N. operation. Of the 25,000–30,000 U.N. troops that will remain in Somalia, less than 4,000 will be United States forces. But they will play a critical role, providing the sort of logistical support and quick-response military muscle that remain areas of unique U.S. competency.

By underwriting U.N. operations for an additional 12 months, this resolution will make a major contribution to peace. The longer the U.N. operation continues, the more likely it is that Somali community leaders—clan elders, businesspeople, clerics, teachers, and others—will be able to overcome the violent factions and rebuild a civil society based on peace and justice.

Far from burdening the United States with expensive foreign entanglements, Operation Restore Hope is a perfect example of how we can unburden ourselves from the role of world policeman. As international organizations like the United Nations grow in strength, they are relieving the United States of the need to conduct peacekeeping and peace enforcement operations on its own. The United States leadership required during the early stages of this process—whether in Somalia or the Persian Gulf—is a wise investment.

And that investment is already paying off. In a dozen peacekeeping efforts around the globe, from Bosnia and Angola to Cambodia and the Middle East, over 50,000 troops under U.N. control are working to create a more stable and peaceful world. Very few U.S. troops participate in those operations.

Withdrawing from Somalia now would be irresponsible, endangering the stability we have so carefully crafted over the past months and wasting the hundreds of millions of dollars we have already spent on the enterprise. It would place at risk the lives of millions of Somalis, undermine the growing strength of the United Nations, and raise severe questions about our credibility as an international actor. And such a step would be an insult to the American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who labored so hard, and at such great personal risk, to craft a lasting peace.

It is with these thoughts in mind that I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 45 as reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to respond in brief to several points that have been made with regard to this legislation.

First, it was noted that the UNOSOM II role for the United States is far more

limited and restricted than was the U.S. role under Operation Restore Hope.

Yet, Senate Joint Resolution 45 expresses support for comprehensive U.N. efforts to rebuild Somali society and create democratic institutions in the country. It strongly implies support for a U.N.—and a United States—military presence in Somalia that some experts estimate could extend into the next century.

The provisions in my substitute specifically state that the restoration of a government in Somalia should be a key U.N. objective and that all foreign forces should be reduced as quickly as the local institutions and the humanitarian situation will permit. And, most importantly, that U.S. forces should be withdrawn in 6 months time.

It is not at all apparent to this Member that we can speak of a limited United States role in Somalia in the context of a complex, nation-building mandate for UNOSOM II that is one of the most ambitious U.N. operations in history.

Second, it was pointed out that the United States is vitally needed in this U.N. operation. Yet, the State Department's most recent list of troop-contributing countries shows that the United Nations has a sufficient number of troops to do the job without U.S. participation. More than troops, what the U.N. needs now are civilians, including administrators, engineers, and development experts.

Third, the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Indiana, pointed out that the Congress must assume its responsibility in committing U.S. troops in partnership with the President. But this is no easy task because the administration has failed to answer repeated inquiries from the gentleman from South Carolina, the distinguished ranking member of the Armed Services Committee Mr. SPENCE, concerning the details of the command and control arrangement under UNOSOM II.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to consider who will have operational control over our troops? How and under what conditions will our Quick Reaction Force be deployed? We need to get answers to these and other questions before we enter into any long-term commitment in Somalia.

Finally, in regard to the cost of the Somalia operation, we've already spent close to \$1 billion on our overall relief and military operations in that country. By the end of next year, the total will rise to about \$1.8 billion—with \$1.4 billion spent on military operations alone.

It is not at all clear to this Member that the American people are willing to sustain this level of commitment for peacekeeping operations in one country. Just 2 weeks ago, the Appropriations Committee failed to include the administration's request for \$300 mil-

lion in supplemental funding for United States support for U.N. peacekeeping operations, including \$103 million for Somalia in particular.

With regard to peacekeeping, our commitments are outrunning our resources. In 1990, U.S. peacekeeping costs totaled \$81 million. This year they could reach \$1.5 billion. Given the ambitious scope of UNOSOM and the high costs associated with every aspect of its operations, the United States will be asked to contribute significant annual assessments that are likely to continue into the next century. Unless and until the administration does a better job of prioritizing our peacekeeping efforts, Congress should not be called upon to rubberstamp them one after another.

And which nations are next? Which nations are facing calamitous conditions similar to Somalia? Sudan, which faces internal chaos and massive starvation? Cambodia, which has been terrorized by the Khmer Rouge for years? Is the United States in a position to commit thousands of troops and billions of dollars to rebuild these nations? Or are we raising false expectations?

Unless the administration does a better job of prioritizing our peacekeeping efforts, it is not clear that Congress is prepared to approve all of these requests.

In response to the comment by my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], that my substitute engages in partisan bickering. It does no such thing. It merely observes something that is obvious to anyone who has followed the events in Somalia—that our policy has changed.

President Bush ordered a quick intervention to confront the humanitarian crisis in that country. It was intended that our U.S. forces were to be withdrawn quickly and replaced by U.N. peacekeepers. Now, however, the U.N. mission in Somalia has been expanded, and the State Department advises that United States forces will be in Somalia for at least another 17 months. I do not intend to praise President Bush or to criticize President Clinton by this resolution. I merely want to register the disagreement of the Congress with this change in our Nation's policy toward Somalia.

□ 1510

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Gilman amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the debate on this Somalia resolution marks a very important turning point in American foreign policy, because it concerns the use of American forces under U.N. command. And, Mr. Chairman, the use of U.N.

peace-keeping forces in this post-cold-war era is becoming more and more frequent, as new international instabilities arise.

Mr. Chairman, while the United States has a continuing role as a world leader in this new era, I think we owe it to ourselves, and the American people, to consider very carefully this new use of American forces under U.N. command, and what it may portend, both for those troops, and for the larger American security interests.

In Somalia we have played a very valuable role, pursuant to U.N. Security Council Resolution 794, to provide a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations. But I would point out that those 20,000 American troops operated under U.S. military command.

Now, however, the remaining U.S. troops will be operating under a U.N. command, and under a new and broader U.N. mandate, as contained in Security Council Resolution 814. Mr. Chairman, as the Republican substitute notes in its findings, this new operation, called UNOSOM II, "is much broader and more open-minded, than the mission originally outlined by President Bush."

It goes beyond the original mandate of providing a secure environment for humanitarian relief efforts. In Resolution 814, the United Nations is committing itself to the more daunting tasks of establishing a democracy, an infrastructure, and of disarming warring factions.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican views on this joint resolution correctly state that the Congress should be involved in any decisions regarding the deployment of any U.S. forces abroad, and a resolution is an appropriate mechanism for such involvement.

But the Republican views go on to warn that the Congress should not feel bound, and I quote, "to provide a blank check to the executive branch, and even more importantly, a blank check to the United Nations for an open-ended commitment of United States Armed Forces to that country."

And yet, Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what we are being asked to do today by the Democrat resolution. Section 2, paragraph 11 of the resolution says, and I quote, "The Congress should authorize any use of United States Armed Forces to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 and 814."

Mr. Chairman, that comes about as close to being a blank check as you can get. That authorization, combined with the language in paragraph 13 of section 2, does not bode well for an expeditious withdrawal of our forces.

Mr. Chairman, if the United States is going to get into the business of providing security cover for every country that may need it, while it attempts to develop its political institutions and its infrastructure, we could end up bogged down in many far corners of the

world for indefinite periods of time. And, Mr. Chairman, this is all being done at the same time that we are undergoing a significant down-sizing in our military establishment, far deeper than I think is prudent.

We must step back now, and ask ourselves just what our vital security interests are, and just how much we can and should be doing. This resolution is not the way to go about such a reassessment of our military role and capabilities, in this new era. Unless the Republican substitute is adopted, I would strongly urge the defeat of Senate Joint Resolution 45.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his supporting comments, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUCKER].

Mr. TUCKER. Mr. Chairman, first of all I would like to congratulate the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], for bringing this proposal to the floor. Obviously we all have been concerned about Somalia and the devastation that has gone on there in the past few years.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, this should not be, and I hope it is not, a partisan or a political position on this issue. President Bush did ask for our forces to instigate and to initiate in December 1992. The question before us now is whether or not an authorization should go beyond 6 months.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, that has been confused by this discussion here is this question of 12 months as opposed to 6 months, because what the bill talks about is a 12-month authorization from the time of deployment. The time of deployment was December 1992, so the 12 months would take up into the end of 1993, in December. What that indicates is that we are already in essence at the 6 month period next month, in June.

Mr. Chairman, we need this extension, and I would respectfully but strongly oppose the Gilman amendment. We need this extension because the interests of Somalis and the interests of peacekeeping around the world will be secured and will be adequately supported by the Hamilton proposal.

If we do not extend for these next 6 months, we will be sending a very bad message and we will be sending a very bad precedent to the UNISOM II efforts, and to any other united peacekeeping efforts as it relates to the United Nations.

By us putting in and by putting in clearly and definitively, the other countries are also putting in their contributions. If we pull out now, it will set a dangerous precedent for any future peacekeeping forces.

We have heard opponents on the other side indicate that this problem

cannot be solved in 12 months or 6 more months after June. If that be the case, then we need to be about the business now of extending it for 6 more months so we can do everything that we can in the short amount of time that we can to help the people out in Somalia, to protect their food, to protect them from any resumption of violence, and to protect any kind of rehabilitation.

In short, Mr. Chairman, I believe it is extremely important that we make sure that we do not set a dangerous precedent and do not abort and abandon the kind of collaborative efforts that we need to keep peace clear around the world. If we do this at this point we are going to set such a bad precedent that we will look up, and whether we are talking about Sudan or any other place around the world, no one will want to join forces with the United States.

The United States, when it joins in with the U.N. collective and collaborative peacekeeping forces, is not guaranteed of commanding those forces. Therefore, the argument that says that we will allow this extension of war powers authorization without having a control and command is a specious one. I think we should concentrate on the real issue, and that is, we should finish the job we started, the job that was started by President Bush, the job that now will be finished under the Clinton administration, and the small price we have to pay at this point to do that I think is justified by the faces of the poor Somalians who look to us for support.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield a minute and a half to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA].

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our independence and freedom, and ask all my colleagues to vote against both the Democratic committee bill and the Republican substitute authorizing United States forces in Somalia.

This is not an easy request to make as I recognize the fine work the minority members of the Foreign Affairs Committee have done in making sure that United States forces do not end up permanently deployed in Somalia. I sincerely appreciate my colleagues fine work.

Nonetheless, as I told fellow members of the Texas delegation last week, I believe both measures contain an unacceptable flaw.

Passage of either the resolution or the substitute represents congressional endorsement of the precedent of putting U.S. troops under U.N. command.

This precedent represents a profound and disturbing change from the integrated NATO military command, as the United Nations is a political, not military institution.

I do not believe that the American people want us to vote to put the des-

tiny and lives of American troops in the hands of U.N. commanders.

In this Chamber is a picture of our first President, General Washington. I believe General Washington would have told us to vote for country, not party, and vote against both the Republican and Democratic versions of the bill.

The committee report explicitly states: "this UNOSOM II command and control is unprecedented because of foreign commander will have operational control over U.S. logistics forces."

I cannot endorse putting American lives under U.N. control in Somalia or Bosnia or anywhere else and I will vote "no."

I urge my colleagues to honor General Washington's legacy and join me in voting against the substitute, the bill, and any future legislation which puts American lives in foreign hands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would announce that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 13 minutes remaining.

Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be allowed to close debate.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, sitting here listening to this debate, I almost think I am in a time warp, back in 1953, and somebody is going to have a sign outside the Chambers, "Impeach Earl Warren and get the United States out of the United Nations." It is almost incredulous.

I hope the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] heard the previous speaker here when he said, "Even under the Gilman amendment, the troops will be under a Turkish general." He said that, a Republican.

We debate the War Powers Act. My gosh, if we ever want this establishment, the U.S. Congress, to be relevant to the situation, then we acknowledge the fact that the War Powers Act is the law of the land. It was passed under President Nixon, he vetoed it, it was overridden by this body and by the U.S. Senate, and it is imperative that we exercise the War Powers Act.

Did we exercise it when there was an invasion of Grenada by President Reagan? No, we did not. Did we exercise it when Panama was invaded? No, we did not. It is time that the U.S. Congress step forward and resume the powers given to it by the law and by the Constitution of the United States.

The mission there in Somalia is not completed. Let me emphasize, and in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], he said, "The administration this, the administra-

tion that," and he repeated it seven times. Remember that on January 20, the date of the inauguration when the Democrats took power of the White House, there were 26,000 troops sitting there in Somalia. There are less than 4,000 today.

I do not have any apprehension of putting 4,000 troops under the command of a Turkish general picked by the United Nations when there is a reserve force sitting out in the Red Sea commanded by the United States, ready to attack if those troops are in any problems.

□ 1520

The 6 months versus 12 months is a compromise. The administration does not want any time restraints on it. The Republicans want 6 months. I think 12 months is a good compromise.

I strongly recommend that we defeat the Gilman amendment and pass the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I think the previous three or four speakers have framed this issue fairly effectively with respect to command and control of American troops, which is a very, very important issue for the American people. And first I think it is important to review some of the debate that has taken place to understand in fact that some American troops will be at times under the tactical command of foreign leaders.

I am quoting from the debate of May 20, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], where he says:

The U.S. quick reaction force, that is the 1,300 troops I referred to a moment ago, will remain under U.S. operational control, although they may receive tactical orders in the field from a U.N. sectional commander.

My colleagues, tactical orders in the field is a euphemism for ordering into battle. That means to go to certain places where you may be fired upon, where you are being fired upon, where you put yourself in harm's way. It could mean going into an area where there is extreme sniper fire. It could mean going into an area where there is a good likelihood of there being an ambush. I means risking American men and women in combat, and we have to understand that because this is an open, honest, and candid debate.

I am informed that actually, and I think this point was made by the last gentleman, that we already have essentially American forces, young American men and women, under this type of command by U.N. leaders. And if somebody has different information, I would like them to give it to my colleagues at this time. But I understand that as recently as May 4 this situation already exists. So we are placing American men and women there.

And is it not interesting, my colleagues, and I have listened to a couple

of members, good members of this committee talk about our young Americans now as being honorable, unselfish, caring, and noble, which of course they are and they have been, young Americans in uniform. For the last several weeks during this debate over whether or not we should force them to serve with homosexuals, they have been referred to, and I am referring to that 80 percent or so of young people who do not want to see the ban lifted, as homophobics, prejudiced, reactionary, and unenlightened, but we are now going to prove that they really all along have been honorable, unselfish, caring, and noble, which, they are, and to prove that we are going to put them in harm's way in Somalia.

I do not believe in the restraints that the War Powers Act attempts to place around the President of the United States, the Chief Executive, and so I would not do anything to validate that act. However, at this point it appears that we have a situation, a status quo which will be extended by Hamilton, which will be extended to some degree, 6 months by Gilman, and only 30 days by Roth, in which young American men and woman can be placed into a dangerous situation, into a combat situation by a foreign commander. And considering the fragility under which our volunteer service exists today, I think that that is an onerous burden and a burden which does not coincide with our constitutional adjudication of power to the Commander in Chief, to the President of the United States as our leader of the armed services.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his supporting comments.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], a member of our Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I remember a few years ago when we were asked to keep our marines in Beirut beyond a period of time that we thought we should keep them there, and many people in this country will remember a terrorist with a truckload of dynamite running through a barricade and going into the place where these people were lodged, blowing up this facility and killing 237 marines.

I believe we could experience a similar situation if we allow our troops to stay for an indefinite period of time in Somalia. President Bush said when we sent our troops to Somalia to feed the hungry masses over there, to stop the marauding gangs from keeping these people from getting their food, that we would be out by inauguration day. Here we are almost into June and we are trying to pass a piece of legislation that will keep them there indefinitely.

Many say this will not keep them there indefinitely. The CIA has said that in order to reach the U.N. mandate we would probably have to keep them there to the year 2000.

And listen to what the legislation says. It says,

The Congress will give strong consideration to extending the authorization for the use of United States armed forces to implement Resolution 814, should such continued use be necessary to ensure the success of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

Remember, the CIA said they would have to stay there probably through the next 6, 7, to 8 years to accomplish their mission, and this legislation says we will give strong consideration to keeping our troops there to comply with this resolution.

We have 3,800 troops there. They have performed their function well. There is no need to keep almost 4,000 American troops there for an indefinite period of time, and in addition to that, under foreign command.

I believe that the people of this country believe the mission has been achieved. The people are getting their food, the starving masses are being fed. This should be turned over to the United Nations, and we should bring our troops home. We should not let them sit there like sitting ducks that sat in Beirut back 10 or 12 years ago when we saw 237 of them killed.

I think that we should support the Gilman amendment because the Gilman amendment gets them out by a date certain, in 6 months. In no more than 6 months we will have them home.

If we follow the Hamilton substitute, we are going to keep them there for an indefinite period of time. And mark my words, there will be a lot of young men and women that will not be coming home on their own two feet. They will be coming home in body bags, and we will all be saying why.

They have accomplished their mission. Let us bring them home.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman HAMILTON for giving me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 45, authorizing the use of American forces in UNOSOM II, the United Nations-led relief effort in Somalia. Our committee and subcommittee chairmen, LEE HAMILTON, HARRY JOHNSTON, and TOM LANTOS, are to be commended for bringing to the House floor a very thoughtful and well-balanced resolution.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 carefully addresses situations in which American troops are participating in a U.N. peace-keeping force. Surely the authority to send U.S. troops into potentially hostile situations is within the province of Congress under the War Powers

Act. If we do not invoke the War Powers Act under these circumstances, we take a step toward forfeiting the prerogatives of the representative branch of government.

Despite what some may argue, this resolution authorizes U.S. participation for a limited time. Should the President decide after 1 year that the presence of our servicemen and women is still needed in Somalia, he must seek approval from Congress for an extension.

We cannot predict future conflicts around the world and should not commit the United States to act as the police for those conflicts. However, it is unlikely that efforts to promote and maintain peace around the globe will be successful without American involvement. Senate Joint Resolution 45 is a judicious resolution that affirms our commitment to peace. I urge my colleagues to support Senate Joint Resolution 45 and oppose the Gilman amendment.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in closing this debate, I urge my colleagues—do not lose sight of the fundamental difference between my substitute and the Hamilton resolution. It is not so much a matter of 6 versus 12 months as it is a question of sorting out our national interests from our international obligations.

As articulated by President Bush, we signed on to a mission to save lives and restore hope to a shattered nation. Our American Armed Forces accomplished this humanitarian mission in Somalia. We take pride in a mission well done.

No one is suggesting that the United States should walk away from the problems in Somalia or from our obligation to support the U.N. operation in that country, but in this effort, no vital American interests are at stake that require any long-term American troop peacekeeping presence.

There are practical limits to what the humanitarian intervention can accomplish in Somalia and most agree that the United States has done more than its fair share in providing food and humanitarian relief to this country.

Now is the time for other nations to provide their troops in support of this operation. I ask my colleagues to support removing our troops from Somalia within 6 months.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the substitute offered by the ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. GILMAN of New York.

I believe his approach is more in keeping with the original intentions of our military mission in Somalia.

In my view, this is not a case where self-evident truth is on one side and total error is on the other.

Foreign policy is not a science. We should not expect to find certitude where reasonable doubt is about as much as you can hope for.

Having said that, I believe the substitute offered by Mr. GILMAN fits the facts of this particular case more closely than the approach of the majority.

Above all, the Gilman substitute has one virtue that is lacking in Senate Joint Resolution 45: I refer to the virtue of decisiveness.

The Gilman substitute states that:

The Congress declares that all United States Armed Forces should be withdrawn from Somalia not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this joint resolution * * *

This direct, unambiguous language stands in stark contrast to that of Senate Joint Resolution 45, which commits the Congress to give strong consideration to extending the authorization beyond the initial 12-month period.

The Gilman substitute has firmness, specificity, and directness. The committee approach is open-ended, vague, and lacks clarity.

In theory there might be some justification for giving the administration what amounts to a blank check.

But in this particular case, prudence dictates that the sooner we get American troops out of Somalia, the better.

President Bush sent them to do a job. The job is done. President Clinton should bring them home.

The time has come to gather up the loose ends of this successful humanitarian mission, and send our men and women home in 6 months or less.

This is what the Gilman substitute will do, with the kind of firmness and directness that marked the operation itself.

That is why I am in favor of it and why I urge our colleagues to vote for it.

□ 1530

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, first of all, let me express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York, the ranking member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. He was quite right when he said earlier that he and I do not usually disagree on foreign policy matters. We do disagree on this particular amendment, but I do want to express my appreciation to him for the very excellent and effective service he gives to the Committee on Foreign Affairs as the ranking member.

Mr. Chairman, I also want to express a word of appreciation to the two subcommittee chairmen who shaped this resolution, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, International Organizations and Human Rights, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa. Both did marvelous work in putting together the resolution.

Now, I think there are several points I would like to make about the Gilman substitute. The first point simply is that Senate Joint Resolution 45 fulfills our constitutional responsibilities, and the Gilman substitute does not.

What Senate Joint Resolution 45 does is to require the Congress to step up to its constitutional responsibilities, assume our role as a partner on the most important decision that government makes, the decision to send American men and women into possible combat. The Gilman substitute, by sidestepping the war powers question, negates the role of the Congress as a constitutional partner in this decisionmaking process.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 includes a war powers resolution, because the purpose of the war powers resolution is to engage the Congress in the process of consultation before and not after the hostilities have occurred. Congress plays a key role under Senate Joint Resolution 45. It does not play a key role under the Gilman substitute.

They have argued on the other side two different positions. The first position is that the President has sufficient authority to deploy troops into combat without congressional authorization on the basis of the Commander-in-Chief clause. That is a respectable point of view. You can make that point of view. I do not happen to agree with that.

I think, under the Constitution, if you make this grave decision the Congress ought to participate in it.

The other point they make is that the President should come back to request special authorization if U.S. troops are to engage in hostilities. Congress then plays a role only after the fact, and in my judgment that is not living up to its responsibilities and stepping up to its responsibilities as the Constitution provides.

The War Powers Act is the existing law. We have a lot of differences of opinion in this institution about the War Powers Act, but it is not our responsibility individually to make a judgment whether the law is constitutional or not. It is the law, and we should then seek to apply it.

Of course, the executive branch is not going to apply the war powers resolution. If the war powers resolution is going to be applied, it is going to be applied by the Congress or not at all. If you do not use the power, then the power is going to be lost. The power is going to be eroded, and we are in a serious situation with respect to that, in my view.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 grants the same type of prior authorization under the War Powers Act as Congress approved for Operation Desert Storm, and many of those who are opposing Senate Joint Resolution 45 found similar war powers language acceptable at the time of Operation Desert Storm.

So the first point then is that we have to step up to our constitutional responsibilities, and Senate Joint Resolution 45 is the way to do it.

The second point is that we have got to have authority to get the job finished in Somalia. To complete the task that President Bush, I think rightly,

committed the United States to do, we have got to ensure a smooth transition to this U.N. force, UNOSOM II, and in order to do that, you have got to have sufficient time.

We are not writing a blank check here. We are not giving unlimited time. I agree with the minority when they say we should have a limited amount of time. I do not happen to agree with the administration when they say our commitment ought to be open-ended.

The question is: What is a reasonable amount of time? The United States is now trying to recruit nations to participate in UNOSOM II. In order for us to be credible in that request that other nations participate, we have to show some staying power ourselves. In our judgment, 12 months is sufficiently long to show the U.S. commitment to UNOSOM II, but it is sufficiently limited in time to make clear that Congress is not endorsing an open-ended involvement.

Many of the comments made by the minority express a concern and a fear that we are going to be there ad infinitum. I agree with that concern. I understand that fear. But may I suggest to you that 6 months is simply too short. If you extend for 6 months now, the time would run out right at the end of the year when the Congress is completing its business, and that would not be a very satisfactory time for us to deal with this.

Let us give the administration a reasonably sufficient amount of time, 12 months, to get all of the troops out.

Now, one other point with respect to this blank check: The U.S. role in UNOSOM II is a very limited role. The minority is right when they say that the U.N. mandate is broad. It is a broad mandate. But the role of the U.S. troops is not broad. It is limited to two functions.

The first function is a logistical function. That is the purpose of the 2,700 logistics troops.

The second function is the combat force, the quick reaction force. That is a very limited role for the United States. It is narrowly defined. It is not a blank check and Senate Joint Resolution 45 endorses a declining role for U.S. forces.

We had 25,000 troops in Somalia as part of Operation Restore Hope, and under UNOSOM II we will have 2,700 logistical troops and 1,300 as a quick reaction force.

It is also important to point out, if you are worried just about money, that the cost for the operations in Somalia will be reduced significantly in the transfer from Operation Restore Hope to UNOSOM II.

Now, there has been a good bit of conversation about the cost of United States efforts in Somalia under UNOSOM II. Let me simply point out that the U.S. peacekeeping assessment for UNOSOM II remains the same

whether or not U.S. troops participate. It is part of our obligation to the United Nations. So you are not saving any money here by voting for the Gilman substitute. The fact is that in 1993 the cost to the United States, as nearly as we can estimate it, was about \$1.2 billion. In 1994, the cost to the United States will be something under \$500 million. So that is a very, very sharp reduction in costs.

One other comment with regard to the command-and-control situation: The statement has been made on several occasions here that U.S. forces ought not to be under foreign command. There is not any doubt that this is an unprecedented situation, and that is one reason it is very important for the U.S. Congress to act. This will be the first time that U.S. forces will be under foreign command in the context of a U.N. peace enforcement operation.

The deputy UNOSOM II commander is Gen. Thomas Montgomery. The U.N. commander is the choice of General Powell.

The point simply is that all decisions by the U.N. commander involving United States forces in Somalia must have General Montgomery's concurrence, and therefore United States concurrence.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 179, noes 248, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 179]

AYES—179

Abercrombie	Crapo	Grandy
Allard	Cunningham	Greenwood
Applegate	Deal	Gunderson
Archer	DeLay	Hamburg
Armey	Diaz-Balart	Hancock
Bachus (AL)	Dickey	Hansen
Baker (CA)	Doolittle	Hastert
Baker (LA)	Dornan	Hefley
Ballenger	Dreier	Herger
Barrett (NE)	Duncan	Hobson
Bartlett	Dunn	Hoekstra
Barton	Emerson	Hoke
Bateman	Everett	Horn
Bentley	Ewing	Houghton
Bereuter	Fawell	Huffington
Bilirakis	Fields (TX)	Hunter
Bliley	Filner	Hutchinson
Blute	Fish	Hyde
Boehner	Fowler	Inglis
Bunning	Franks (CT)	Inhofe
Burton	Franks (NJ)	Istook
Buyer	Galleghy	Johnson (CT)
Callahan	Gallo	Johnson (SD)
Calvert	Gekas	Kasich
Canady	Gilchrest	Kim
Castle	Gillmor	King
Clinger	Gilman	Kingston
Coble	Gingrich	Klug
Collins (GA)	Goodlatte	Knollenberg
Combest	Goodling	Kolbe
Cox	Goss	Kyl
Crane	Grams	Lazio

Levy	Packard
Lewis (CA)	Parker
Lewis (FL)	Paxon
Lightfoot	Petri
Linder	Pombo
Livingston	Porter
Machtley	Portman
Manzullo	Pryce (OH)
McCandless	Quillen
McCollum	Quinn
McCrery	Ramstad
McDade	Ravenel
McHugh	Regula
McInnis	Ridge
McKeon	Roberts
McMillan	Rogers
Meyers	Rohrabacher
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen
Michel	Roth
Miller (FL)	Roukema
Molinaro	Royce
Moorhead	Santorum
Morella	Saxton
Murphy	Schaefer
Myers	Schiff
Nadler	Schroeder
Nussle	Sensenbrenner
Oxley	Shaw

NOES—248

Ackerman	Evans
Andrews (ME)	Faleomavaega
Andrews (NJ)	(AS)
Andrews (TX)	Fazio
Bacchus (FL)	Fields (LA)
Baessler	Fingerhut
Barcia	Flake
Barlow	Foglietta
Barrett (WI)	Ford (MI)
Becerra	Ford (TN)
Beilenson	Frank (MA)
Berman	Frost
Bevill	Furse
Blibray	Gedjenson
Bishop	Gephardt
Blackwell	Geren
Boehrlert	Gibbons
Bonilla	Glickman
Borski	Gonzalez
Boucher	Gordon
Brewster	Green
Brooks	Gutierrez
Browder	Hall (OH)
Brown (CA)	Hall (TX)
Brown (FL)	Hamilton
Brown (OH)	Harman
Bryant	Hastings
Byrne	Hayes
Camp	Hefner
Cantwell	Hinchey
Cardin	Hoagland
Carr	Hochbrueckner
Chapman	Holden
Clay	Hoyer
Clayton	Hughes
Clement	Hutto
Clyburn	Inslie
Coleman	Jacobs
Collins (IL)	Jefferson
Collins (MI)	Johnson (GA)
Condit	Johnson, E.B.
Cooper	Johnson, Sam
Coppersmith	Johnston
Costello	Kanjorski
Coyne	Kaptur
Cramer	Kennedy
Danner	Kennelly
Darden	Kildee
de la Garza	Kleczka
de Lugo (VI)	Klein
DeFazio	Klink
DeLauro	Kopetski
Dellums	Kreidler
Derrick	LaFalce
Deutsch	Lambert
Dicks	Lancaster
Dingell	Lantos
Dixon	LaRocco
Dooley	Laughlin
Durbin	Lehman
Edwards (CA)	Levin
Edwards (TX)	Lewis (GA)
English (AZ)	Lipinski
English (OK)	Lloyd
Eshoo	Long

Shays	Sangmeister
Shuster	Sarpalius
Skeen	Sawyer
Smith (MI)	Schenk
Smith (NJ)	Schumer
Smith (OR)	Scott
Smith (TX)	Serrano
Snowe	Sharp
Solomon	Shepherd
Spence	Sisisky
Stearns	Skaggs
Stump	Skelton
Sundquist	Slattery
Taylor (NC)	Slaughter
Thomas (CA)	Smith (IA)
Thomas (WY)	Spratt
Torkildsen	Stark
Upton	Stokes
Vucanovich	Strickland
Walker	
Walsh	
Weldon	
Wolf	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	
Zeliff	
Zimmer	

Studds	Valentine
Stupak	Velazquez
Swett	Vento
Swift	Visclosky
Synar	Volkmmer
Talent	Washington
Tanner	Waters
Tauzin	Watt
Taylor (MS)	Waxman
Tejeda	Wheat
Thornton	Whitten
Thurman	Wilson
Torres	Wise
Torricelli	Woolsey
Towns	Wyden
Trafigant	Wynn
Tucker	Yates
Underwood (GU)	
Unsoeld	

NOT VOTING—10

Hilliard	Stenholm
Leach	Thompson
Romero-Barcelo	Williams
(PR)	

□ 1602

Mr. FOGLIETTA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. NADLER changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 103-97 which the Chair understands will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 103-97.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROTH

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROTH: Page 8, strike out line 11 and all that follows through line 22 on page 9 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(8) Upon completion of the transfer of operations from the United States-led force in Somalia to the United Nations-led force in Somalia, all United States Armed Forces should be withdrawn from Somalia. Thereafter United States Armed Forces should not participate in or operate in support of the United Nations-led force in Somalia and the United States should not contribute to the costs of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

Page 10, line 3, strike out "Congress supports" and insert in lieu thereof "United States has provided more support than any other country for".

Page 10, strike out line 14 and all that follows through line 6 on page 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 4. USE OF THE ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—The President is authorized to use United States Armed Forces to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 (1992) and 814 (1993) until June 30, 1993.

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.—All United States Armed Forces shall be withdrawn from Somalia not later than June 30, 1993. After that date United States Armed Forces shall not participate in or operate in support of the United Nations-led force in Somalia.

Page 11, line 7, strike out "(b)" and insert in lieu thereof "(c)"; and strike out line 17 and all that follows through line 2 on page 12.

Page 12, strike out line 3 and all that follows through line 20 on page 14 (section 5) and insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 5. TERMINATION OF UNITED STATES FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS IN SOMALIA.

After June 30, 1993, the United States may not make any payment to the United Nations (including the United Nations Trust Fund for Somalia) as a contribution (either assessed or voluntary) toward costs incurred after that date for peacekeeping or other military operations in Somalia authorized by the United Nations Security Council acting under Chapter VI or VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

Page 15, line 22, after "States" insert "(subject to the limitation provided in section 5)".

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposed will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

□ 1610

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, in the previous amendment last December, when the American people saw starving children in Somalia, the hearts of the American people were touched. Treasure, food and soldiers were sent to the starving people of Somalia. The President, at that time, told the American people that we must take action forthwith, and he sent, at the behest of the United Nations, some 25,000 troops to Somalia.

There were those of us who were in favor of helping the people of Somalia, but we did question the length or duration of time our soldiers would have to be in Somalia.

We were told by the old administration, and it was concurred in by the current administration, that all of our troops would be out by inauguration day, January 20, 1993. Well, we all knew that would be almost impossible, but that's what we were told. So after inauguration day came and passed, we again raised the issue of when would our troops be out of Somalia. We were told that they would certainly be out by spring, or within 6 months at the longest.

Now we have a resolution before us which reads that not only are our troops not going to be out of Somalia, but we are going to keep some over 4,000 troops in Somalia, and who knows how many troops offshore in the Somalia region for at least 1 year or longer. For the next year or more, if Congress passes this resolution before us today, our troops could be in harms' way in Somalia for at least 1 year or more. I don't think that the American people would endorse this action. The American people have been told that the U.N. has taken over the responsibilities in Somalia.

Well, if that is true why not bring our troops home? Although the mandate to the United Nations was, technically, only for 6 months, it is now estimated by the U.N. officials that they are going to be expected to remain for 2 years.

The price tag for our involvement, so far, has been \$1 billion. I think the American people have done their share. We took immediate action. We had our troops there not only until January 20, but for a total of over 6 months. We spent \$1 billion of money which, quite frankly, we don't have. It is all borrowed money that our children will have to repay plus interest.

And so, I have an amendment before us which truly does turn over our involvement in Somalia to the United Nations. My amendment sets forth that we will remove our troops from Somalia as of June 30. Quite frankly, that is almost 6 months longer, 6 months more time than we were told was necessary when troops were first placed into Somalia last December 4.

So, this amendment even goes far beyond what was originally projected. I am very concerned about this situation, because if Congress does not set a time certain when our troops will be removed from Somalia, we are going to be there, mark my words, not only 1 year from now, or 2 years from now, but at the turn of the century, you will still have American troops in Somalia.

Now, the administration is talking about having troops in Macedonia, talks about having troops in Bosnia, and who knows where else in the world. As one of the leading Democrat spokesmen for the Foreign Affairs Committee said, "We must be involved everywhere in the world." When I asked for a clarification, he was frank and candid enough to respond and say, "I said we must be involved everywhere in the world, and I meant we must be involved everywhere in the world." Many people in Congress share that foreign policy goal. However, from my reading of American public opinion, that is not the American people's perception of what our international commitments should be.

I think that if we are going to be involved everywhere in the world, we are going to be bled to death financially, we already have a \$400 billion deficit, we have over \$4 trillion in a national debt. We cannot keep going in this direction and not suffer grave consequences. The day of reckoning is nearly at hand. We had better be circumspect and wise in our decisions. I ask you not to be like lemmings in a mad rush to the sea. We do not want to lead America to financial suicide. We owe it to the American people, to the people who have put their confidence and trust in us that we make wise and judicious decisions, and the wise decision in this regard, with our troops in Somalia, is to have a date certain when they will be withdrawn.

After all, the American people, the United Nations and the people throughout the world have been told that this is a U.N. initiative. If it is a U.N. initiative, if it is truly a U.N. initiative, then let the United Nations truly take charge. Let us remove our troops as of June 30.

Without my resolution, without my amendment, if Congress passes this resolution, it is going to cost the American taxpayer another \$1 billion in the next year. We can't spend another \$1 billion after we just spent \$1 billion in Somalia. We cannot be spending several billion dollars in Russia and other billions of dollars in the Republics. Can we continue to increase foreign aid? Secretary of State Christopher was before our committee and asked for an increase in foreign aid on Tuesday. I ask, when is it all going to stop? We have huge deficits. We have a huge national debt. We owe it to our people to think about the consequences of our spending. We are being bled to death. We are being smothered with debt. And, we are not being fair or truthful or honest with the people who put their trust in us, the American taxpayer.

And, that's why this amendment is so important. It is also important to be fair with our servicemen who are serving in Somalia, our service men and women who have been in Somalia since before the beginning of the year to stabilize and feed that country, who were told that they were going to be home by January 20, who were told that they were going to be home by spring, definitely after 6 months, and now we're going to keep over 4,000 of them there for at least 1 year or longer.

There is no cutoff date. We have got to have a date certain for our people who serve in uniform. We owe it to them. Our first obligation must always be to our taxpayers, and to our men and women in uniform.

The Secretary of State was before our Foreign Affairs Committee asking for an increase in foreign aid, while we're taxing Social Security, and while the majority in this Congress are going to vote for the largest tax increase in history.

At the same time, we are increasing foreign aid and shoveling billions of dollars overseas. I do not think this is the direction the American people are asking the Congress to pursue.

Quite frankly, when the Congress is scratching its head, wondering why the American people are so hostile to the people who serve in the Congress, the reason is, because the people in this Congress do not fulfill the wishes of the American people.

For example, I think the American people want a date certain for our withdrawal and let the U.N. take over this mandate. Under the present arrangements, U.S. troops are under the command of a foreign commander. This is, I think the first time that's hap-

pened. Are we really prepared to have American troops under the leadership and command of a foreign general? I think the American people want to help the starving people of the world, but, we have already spent 6 months more in Somalia than was originally assured that we were going to have to do. And, that we have already spent \$1 billion.

I think the American people are saying that if the United Nations and other nations are truly taking over in Somalia, then let them take over and allow our troops to come home. We have spent \$1 billion, and that's a lot of money, especially to a country like ours that does not have it. Our hearts did go out to the starving people of Somalia, but we have done our part, and then some. We have done our duty.

My amendment gives this Congress a clear choice, either to go along with the never-ending American commitment in Somalia, or draw the line and let the United Nations do their part. We have troops all over the world, we're being bled to death, we must think about our domestic commitments, too. Our American military is quickly becoming a "911" for every trouble spot in the world.

This is not a wise foreign policy. Open-ended commitments in all of these operations are not wise. They are foolhardy, we are indulging in folly, and the American people can sense this, and know this instinctively. And, that is why they are so hostile to their Congress. I am convinced that if the American people were voting in a referendum, that my amendment would be adopted, overwhelmingly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment?

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members of the House to oppose this amendment. Let me just state specifically what this amendment does. It makes sure that all United States forces are withdrawn from Somalia in 5 weeks. In 5 weeks. Even if we mandated a complete withdrawal today, it could not be completed in 5 weeks.

The amendment of our good friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], also prohibits the United States from making any payment to the United Nations as a contribution toward costs incurred after June 30, 1993, for peacekeeping or other military operations in Somalia.

If we were to withdraw completely as of June 30, the participation of other member states would be in jeopardy

and the entire operation would fall apart.

Mr. Chairman, the head of the U.N. Command is Admiral Howe, a former member of the Bush administration and the National Security Council. He is an extremely responsible officer who desperately wants to see some kind of stability coming from the Congress so that he can complete his mission in 1 year. So to complete the task that President Bush rightly committed the United States to in December, we should simply ensure a smooth transition to a U.N.-led operation.

Our mission is not going to be complete until that environment in Somalia will remain secure for the continued delivery of humanitarian assistance so that a broader U.N. mission can be built on a firm foundation. We need to do a full job, and a minimal level of U.S. participation is going to be critical.

Mr. Chairman, I recently had the opportunity some 4 weeks ago to visit our troops in Somalia. I saw a nation that has been totally devastated by drought, by war, and by anarchy. If I had any doubts about the need of an international presence in Somalia before my visit, they were quickly erased when I saw the very difficult but important job our marines are doing.

In meeting with the marines, the United Nations, and a group of NGO's working in Somalia, I came to understand that an international presence is needed to ensure that the warlords do not take control of the country again. If there is any kind of precipitous withdrawal of U.S. forces or the U.N. operation, these warlords would take over completely and there would be more chaos and more killing.

People in Mogadishu are no longer starving or dying because of our presence. If we were to leave, the dying would begin once again.

Last December President Bush rightly committed the United States to action in Somalia. We hoped he could have the job done within a few months. Unfortunately, there remains a lot to be done. President Clinton has rightly decided to continue our presence in Somalia, but to reduce the number of American troops and to transfer major responsibility to the United Nations.

This resolution authorizes a reduced American role for the next year, but clearly extends our constructive role in trying to resolve this crisis.

Mr. Chairman, it was once said that politics ends at the water's edge. By passing this resolution unamended, as did the other body, we are going to continue a policy that is both constructive, bipartisan, and demonstrates what this country is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for the resolution and opposition to the amendment.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois

[Mr. MANZULLO], who has given this a good deal of consideration.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Roth amendment. When President Bush first sent over troops to Somalia, we were supposed to be out by Inauguration Day. Our mission was to stabilize the situation until a U.N. force took over. American forces held the fort, waiting for the U.N. cavalry to arrive. That took 5 months. We paid the bill.

Our magnificent Armed forces did the job well. Food is getting to the people in Somalia. The situation is much more stabilized than was reported on our TV screens last December.

We've already spent nearly \$1 billion on this operation with more expenditures on the way. We've done our fair share. In the name of fiscal sanity, it's time to bring our troops home.

The resolution before us contains at least a 1-year carte blanche for the President to do whatever with the remaining 3,600 American service personnel in Somalia. Plus, they are under United Nations command. They now take their orders from a Turkish general.

If we do not bring our troops home and cancel our open-ended commitment to the Somalia operations, we will spend another \$450 million—on top of the \$1 billion we have already spent. And that will go on year after year after year. We will spend billions. That is another reason to vote for the Roth amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to respect our sovereignty, it is time to bring our troops home and bring them home now. We cannot let them hang out there with the uncertainty that they may not come home for another year, or even by the end of the decade. That would be a prescription for disaster.

That's why I encourage my colleagues to vote for the Roth amendment. It would bring all our troops home from Somalia by June 30 and end the hemorrhaging of hard-earned tax dollars to a mission that has been accomplished. Support the Roth amendment. It is time to draw the line.

□ 1620

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. JOHNSTON], chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, let me repeat what my colleague from New Mexico said. If the Roth amendment is passed, then we pull the plug in less than 5 weeks. And if we do that, we literally collapse the organization of the United Nations being in Somalia. Because many of those countries, there are 35 countries that have committed troops to this operation, and the linchpin is the United States, even though we will have less than 4,000 troops there out of 28,000.

Now, I am the first one to concede that we cannot inject ourselves unilaterally and intervene into every civil disobedience or humanitarian operation. That is why the United Nations is so critical here, and that is why I have no fear in allowing a Turk general in command over less than 4,000 troops, when General Montgomery of the United States Army literally has a veto over his operation.

What the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] is saying is that if we put 10 troops in Cambodia, then we have to be in charge. If we put 20 troops in Zimbabwe, we have to be in charge. And I could go down the whole operation here.

Everyone is, I think, misrepresenting the time limitation. Let me read from the resolution here:

The authorization provided by subsection (a) shall expire at the earlier of the end of the 12-month period beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution, unless the Congress finds that continued participation is necessary.

That literally means that we have got to come back to this body to get an extension of the 12 months. The authorization expires in 12 months.

There is no ambiguity there, and I strongly recommend that we defeat the Roth amendment and pass the resolution.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, with respect to my colleague from Indiana and also from New Mexico, we had full support on both sides of the aisle when we went into this area, but I would also tell my friend from New Mexico, it is Admiral Crowe, not Admiral Howe, and this is the same Clinton supporter that said we did not need any support in the Middle East, just prior to Desert Storm.

Let us look at what is really facing us. The President's budget is cutting defense \$127 billion. Base closures are tearing the heart out of our military families. We are looking to possibly getting into Bosnia, even North Korea. Equipment, the military is scratching to replace its worn materials. They are trying to put homosexuals in the military, and not even our command will not be controlled by U.S. command.

They are also cutting out impact aid for education for military families. In an All-Volunteer Force, retention is important. But even with all of these above problems, the No. 1 issue in retention is family separation.

How about the 4,000 families back here in the United States? I respect my colleague from Indiana in what he is trying to do, but let me bring up some other things that are important.

There is an increase in vote on taxes on Thursday that this body is going to be voting for, \$4 trillion deficit, \$1.5 billion bucks per day, education cuts. The

RTC next month is going to ask us for \$48 billion more, and there is \$150 billion coming up in health care.

If we care anything about our military families, we have destroyed and cut them to pieces enough. Let us bring them home, and let us bring them out of Somalia. I support the Roth amendment.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PAYNE].

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 45 to authorize United States forces in Somalia. For the first time in many years America is viewed by the world community as helping the powerless and homeless—and without a cold war agenda.

We helped particularly women and children, who were literally too weak to speak for themselves, and who had been the brutalized victims of the ruthless male warlords.

Now we are faced with the decision to authorize this good work to be consistent with the War Powers Act which I support, but more importantly to give the administration the authority to continue our involvement in Somalia until there is a presence of peace and stability.

What we are being asked to vote on is to finish the task America set out to accomplish when then President Bush committed 28,000 troops in early December 1992. This action by President Bush was a logical step to insure the success of the food distribution program by airlift that began in August of that same year.

When I visited Somalia in November 1992 it was obvious that our airlifts were unsuccessful. As soon as food was put down on the ground it was taken by rival factions, or unaffiliated armed bands of Somali young men carrying out a campaign of fear and terror. They were heavily armed with semiautomatic rifles, and were destroying their homes and communities. They had become bandits accountable to no one.

Upon my return I stated that, and I quote:

I hope the Somalia Tragedy is not what the New World Order is about, allowing a country to die because it is no longer strategic in the United States' political and economic interest.

I concurred with Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM that the United Nations must ensure security by sending increased U.N. troops. But, I added to that, and I quote again:

The United States should set an example by volunteering our forces which have the capacity to arrive before it is too late.

And arrive they did. President Bush proved that the new world order really was for helping the weak against the strong as he had pointed out in the gulf war era. That the new world order really was to help people who were in need

of help, which, in my community in northern New Jersey, went over very big.

We can be justly proud of the job our servicemen rendered in Somalia. A job done with sensitivity to Somali pride, and a respect for the preciousness of the human lives saved by their patience and discipline. Just the other day the independent Weekly Review in Kenya ran a headline that said "Somalia: The American Effort Was Well Worth It."

I was pleased when President Clinton gave full support to continue the job as a part of the United Nations' UNOSOM II operation in Somalia by providing logistic and related support, and to provide a tactical quick reaction force under United States command, to respond to requests for emergency assistance from the United Nations Force Commander in Somalia.

This is why we must give our new President the time necessary and the authorization of the War Powers Act to complete our humanitarian mission in Somalia. There was bipartisan support for President Bush when he started down this road to compassion for the Somalia people, and there should be bipartisan support for President Clinton in completing the task.

Mr. Chairman, I call for support of Senate Joint Resolution 45 to authorize United States forces in Somalia.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who has devoted a major part of his life to these issues.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] for offering this amendment and for his constructive efforts on this issue as it has moved through committee to the floor.

It is clear that the gentleman and I share many concerns regarding when and under what circumstances U.S. forces will depart. In addition, I share his sentiments on the significant financial costs inflicted on the United States by a continued presence in Somalia.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] has 5 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 4½ minutes remaining. Under the rules of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be allowed to close.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for his kind remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER].

□ 1630

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I also thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] for his commendable amendment, and I want to also give my

kudos to the ranking member of the committee and to everyone who has worked on this difficult issue on both sides of the aisle.

The last speaker said that we have a responsibility to starving people around the world. I concur in that. We also have a responsibility to the men and women who wear the uniform of the United States. With respect to this responsibility, make no mistake about it, American military people under all analyses with respect to the law that we are operating under and the United Nations, our American military people are cooperating under the tactical command and will operate in certain combat situations under the tactical command of foreign commanders.

I quote very quickly the statement by the chairman of the committee:

The U.S. Quick Reaction Force, that is, the 1,300 troops I referred to a moment ago, will remain under U.S. operational control, although they may receive tactical orders in the field from the United Nations sectional commander.

That is a euphemism for ordering people into battle, and that is exactly the right that the U.N. commander has. We have a duty to see to it that our men and women who wear the uniform operate under American military commanders, because that allows us, the American people, to have accountability for the actions and the determinations that our military leaders make.

General Schwarzkopf is accountable for his actions, or was accountable for his actions, as a U.S. military commander, to the American political establishment. A general from Turkey or Egypt or some other place is not accountable to the American people, and we should see to it that we end this situation as quickly as possible.

Second, we have to teach our allies to share these burdens. They also have a responsibility to the starving people of the world. Let me just tell the Members, the account stands as such right now: \$1 billion spent by the United States, and \$100 million spent by the rest of the world.

Until we give them a larger part of this responsibility by leaving, they are not going to voluntarily pick it up.

The Roth amendment is very commendable.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS].

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me just say to my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] that nothing has cost the American people more in blood than isolationism in any guise. The notion of stopping the world because we want to get off is not a very productive notion in 1993.

I would like to see every single American soldier back from Somalia tomorrow, not in 30 days or 45 days,

but as the world's one remaining superpower, unless we organize and provide structure to assist them with international security, our costs in blood and treasure will be mind-boggling.

The notion of pretending that complex issues can be solved with a push-button solution is simply absurd. There is no way that this Somalia venture can continue if the United States continues its participation in it. Everything that we have invested in blood and treasure will go down the drain. A superpower of our complexity and sophistication needs some staying power, it needs some long-range perspective. It must recognize that this is a complex world. What my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin, is complaining about is the complexity of the world we live in, not the specifics of how many days our troops will be there.

There will be crises beyond Somalia and Bosnia and Cambodia, and the United States will have a responsibility for participating and anticipating these crises and solving them. To set these ludicrous and arbitrary deadlines, as if that would be a solution, is just a new guise of isolationism.

Had we stopped Hitler early on, the Second World War would not have occurred. Had we stopped Milos Lovic when he started his ethnic cleansing, the tragedy in Yugoslavia would not have occurred. That is long-term planning, long-term participation, and the involvement of other nations that is called for, not the establishment of simplistic deadlines of 30 or 45 days.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, let us be clear about this. The Roth amendment does three things: It withdraws our troops by June 30, it cancels further United States funds for Somalia, and it mirrors American public opinion today. It does not affect humanitarian aid. We have done our share in Somalia, and we have done it well.

On December 9, we went in to stabilize things for humanitarian reasons. We spent nearly \$1 billion. No other nation has done that much. Now other nations are being asked to do their share, and the more we do, the less others will do. They will hold back.

Unless we withdraw, we will likely be stuck there for quite a while. The question is how long. The State Department says maybe 17 months. The United Nations says maybe 18 months to 2 years. The intelligence community says maybe up to 7 or 8 years to take care of the problems over there.

I suggest that there is a cost involved as well. We have put in \$1 billion. Estimates are if we go the length that we have been talking about, we are looking at \$450 million. Those are big dollars today.

We avoid the U.N. command issue if we support the Roth amendment,

which is divisive and troublesome, especially to people like myself who have proudly worn our Nation's uniform in one of our armed services.

Finally, I think the line draws here when we say we have done our share, we have done it well. Support Roth.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his excellent statement.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], who is vice chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and who has been following this issue also for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 1½ minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Let me just say, Mr. Chairman, that I have voted, along with most of the people in this Chamber, to send our troops over to Somalia to help the starving masses and to stop those roving gangs, but it is time to bring our troops home. I want to read to the Members what is going on over there. This is about our troops, from an article in the Washington Post on Thursday, May 6, 1993.

It says that the troops:

*** endure attacks from rock-throwing children by day and snipers by night. They complained that their role had shifted from feeding the starving to policing a dangerous urban environment, a role for which they were not trained.

One of the troops over there wrote all over the walls, "Send us home. We have done our job. Send us home."

The chairman of this committee, the chairman of this committee said, and I quote:

The mission of the U.S. forces is narrowly defined. U.S. troops will withdraw as soon as a secure environment for relief operations has been created.

That has been done. He said:

Second, Operation Restore Hope must end soon. This requires that the mission of U.S. forces remain clear, consistent, and limited in scope. It also requires that a strong U.N. force be ready to replace the U.S. troops within several months.

That has been done. It is costing U.S. troops \$5 million a day.

Finally, the chairman of this committee said, and I quote:

We must work to ensure that Operation Restore Hope concludes safely, successfully, and soon.

We have 34 other countries over there. We have done our share. We do not want to have our kids, our young men and women, sitting around as sitting ducks. They have done their job honorably. We have supported them. Let us bring them home and support the Roth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Roth amendment. First, let us be clear what the Roth amendment does. It really does two things. Number one, it brings all of our troops out in 5 week's time. Number two, it cuts any United States funding from the United Nations operation in Somalia.

We just voted a few minutes ago in this Chamber against a Gilman substitute that provided 6 month's time before we had to get out. Now they come in with an amendment for only 5 week's time. That obviously is much too short. If we voted against the 6 month period, we are going to have to vote, it seems to me, against an even shorter period of time, which is 5 weeks.

It is important to understand here that the United States is a key actor in Somalia. If we simply pull out the rug from the Somalia operation, then there will not be a Somalia operation, and all of the investment and all of the effort that we have made in Operation Restore Hope, in which most of us in this Chamber have a great deal of pride, justifiably, would be lost. We want to try to complete the task.

□ 1650

We want a smooth transition from the U.S. effort to the U.N. effort, and that is what this resolution is all about. The Roth amendment would totally undercut that transition.

Second, the Roth amendment cuts our funding for the United Nations. We went to the United Nations a few weeks ago and we voted for this resolution. We said to the world and the United Nations that we are going to support this effort. If we come along now and cut our financial support, we are reneging on a commitment that we made to support the Somali effort. But beyond that, we are also reneging on support of peacekeeping assessments in general.

My friends, I strongly urge Members not to support the Roth amendment. It would pull the rug out from UNOSOM II. It would provide no money for the United Nations and renege on the commitments that the United States Government has solemnly made in the Security Council.

I urge the defeat of the Roth amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 127, noes 299, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 180]

AYES—127

Allard	Grandy	Packard
Archer	Green	Petri
Bachus (AL)	Hancock	Pombo
Baker (CA)	Hansen	Portman
Baker (LA)	Hastert	Quillen
Ballenger	Hefley	Quinn
Barrett (NE)	Herger	Ramstad
Bartlett	Hobson	Ravenel
Barton	Hoekstra	Regula
Bentley	Hoke	Roberts
Bereuter	Horn	Rogers
Billakis	Huffington	Rohrabacher
Blute	Hunter	Ros-Lehtinen
Bonilla	Inglis	Roth
Bunning	Inhofe	Roukema
Burton	Istook	Royce
Callahan	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Camp	Johnson, Sam	Schaefer
Clinger	Kim	Sensenbrenner
Coble	Kingston	Shaw
Collins (GA)	Klink	Shuster
Combest	Klug	Smith (MI)
Cox	Knollenberg	Smith (OR)
Crane	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Levy	Snowe
Cunningham	Lewis (FL)	Solomon
DeLay	Lightfoot	Spence
Doolittle	Linder	Stearns
Duncan	Livingston	Stump
Dunn	Machtley	Sundquist
Everett	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Ewing	McCollum	Thomas (CA)
Fields (TX)	McHugh	Thomas (WY)
Franks (CT)	McInnis	Vucanovich
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Walker
Galleghy	McMillan	Walsh
Gallo	Meyers	Weldon
Gekas	Mica	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Moorhead	Young (FL)
Gilman	Murphy	Zeliff
Goodling	Myers	Zimmer
Goss	Nussle	
Grams	Oxley	

NOES—299

Abercrombie	Collins (MI)	Frank (MA)
Ackerman	Condit	Frost
Andrews (ME)	Cooper	Furse
Andrews (NJ)	Coppersmith	Gedensson
Andrews (TX)	Costello	Gephardt
Applegate	Coyne	Geren
Armey	Cramer	Gibbons
Bacchus (FL)	Danner	Gillmor
Baesler	Darden	Gingrich
Barcia	de la Garza	Glickman
Barlow	de Lugo (VI)	Gonzalez
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Goodlatte
Bateman	DeFazio	Gordon
Becerra	DeLauro	Greenwood
Beilenson	Dellums	Gunderson
Berman	Derrick	Gutierrez
Bevill	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Bilbray	Diaz-Balart	Hall (TX)
Bishop	Dickey	Hamburg
Blackwell	Dicks	Hamilton
Bliley	Dingell	Harman
Boehlert	Dixon	Hastings
Boehner	Dooley	Hayes
Borski	Dornan	Hefner
Boucher	Dreier	Hinchey
Brewster	Durbin	Hoagland
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Hochbrueckner
Browder	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Brown (CA)	Emerson	Hoyer
Brown (FL)	Engel	Hughes
Brown (OH)	English (AZ)	Hutchinson
Bryant	English (OK)	Hutto
Buyer	Eshoo	Hyde
Byrne	Evans	Inslie
Calvert	Faleomavaega	Jacobs
Canady	(AS)	Jefferson
Cantwell	Fawell	Johnson (GA)
Cardin	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Carr	Fields (LA)	Johnson, E.B.
Castle	Filner	Johnston
Chapman	Fingerhut	Kanjorski
Clay	Fish	Kasich
Clayton	Flake	Kennedy
Clement	Foglietta	Kennelly
Clyburn	Ford (MI)	Kildee
Coleman	Ford (TN)	King
Collins (IL)	Fowler	Kleczka

Klein	Nadler	Shepherd
Kolbe	Natcher	Sisisky
Kopetski	Neal (MA)	Skaggs
Kreidler	Neal (NC)	Skeen
LaFalce	Norton (DC)	Skelton
Lambert	Oberstar	Slattery
Lancaster	Obey	Slaughter
Lantos	Olver	Smith (IA)
LaRocco	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Laughlin	Orton	Spratt
Lazio	Owens	Stark
Lehman	Pallone	Stenholm
Levin	Parker	Stokes
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Paxon	Studds
Lipinski	Payne (NJ)	Stupak
Lloyd	Payne (VA)	Swett
Long	Pelosi	Swift
Lowey	Penny	Synar
Maloney	Peterson (FL)	Talent
Mann	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Manton	Pickett	Tauzin
Margolies-	Pickle	Taylor (MS)
Mezvinsky	Pomeroy	Tejeda
Markey	Porter	Thornton
Martinez	Poshard	Thurman
Matsui	Price (NC)	Torkildsen
Mazzoli	Pryce (OH)	Torres
McCandless	Rahall	Torricelli
McCloskey	Rangel	Towns
McCrery	Reed	Trafficant
McCurdy	Reynolds	Tucker
McDade	Richardson	Underwood (GU)
McDermott	Roemer	Unsold
McHale	Romero-Barcelo	Upton
McKinney	(PR)	Valentine
McNulty	Rose	Velazquez
Meehan	Rostenkowski	Vento
Meek	Rowland	Visclosky
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Volkmer
Mfume	Rush	Washington
Michel	Sabo	Waters
Miller (CA)	Sanders	Watt
Miller (FL)	Sangmeister	Waxman
Mineta	Santorum	Wheat
Minge	Sarpalius	Whitten
Mink	Sawyer	Wilson
Moakley	Schiff	Wise
Molinari	Schroeder	Wolf
Mollohan	Schumer	Woolsey
Montgomery	Scott	Wyden
Moran	Serrano	Wynn
Morella	Sharp	Yates
Murtha	Shays	

NOT VOTING—11

Bonior	Houghton	Schenk
Conyers	Kaptur	Thompson
Henry	Leach	Williams
Hilliard	Ridge	

□ 1702

Messrs. BARLOW, DREIER, and PAXON, and Mrs. MORELLA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 103-97. It is the further understanding of the Chair that that amendment will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 103-97.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SOLOMON

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SOLOMON: Page 10, after line 13, insert the following new section 4 and redesignate existing sections 4 through 7 accordingly:

SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) prior to United Nations-authorized operations in Somalia, over 300,000 Somalis (including one fourth of the children under the age of five) died due to civil strife, disease, and famine, and at least one-half of Somalia's population of 8,000,000 people, were considered at risk of starvation;

(2) the number of deaths from starvation in Somalia has declined significantly since the arrival of the United States-led force in Somalia; and

(3) the United States contributed immeasurably to the United States-led force in Somalia, including the deployment of over 20,000 members of the Armed Forces and the loss of American lives.

(b) COMMENDATION OF U.S. ARMED FORCES.—The Congress commended the United States Armed Forces for successfully establishing a secure environment for the humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] will be recognized for 15 minutes, and a Member opposite—if there is a Member opposed—will be recognized for 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and ranking member, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] for allowing me the opportunity to offer my amendment commending the United States Armed Forces for successfully establishing a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is similar to House Concurrent Resolution 26 which has strong bipartisan support.

And states that prior to the United Nations authorized operation in Somalia, over 300,000 Somalis—including one-fourth of the children under the age of 5—died due to civil strife, disease, and famine, and at least half of Somalia's population of 8 million people, were considered at risk of starvation.

The resolution points out that the number of deaths from starvation in Somalia has declined significantly since the arrival of the United States-led force in Somalia.

And, that the United States contributed immeasurably to Operation Restore Hope including the deployment of over 20,000 military troops and the loss of American lives.

The amendment concludes by commending United States Armed Forces for successfully establishing a secure environment for humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

In the end, Mr. Chairman, over 28,000 United States servicemen were deployed in Somalia. They came under

enemy fire and a number of American lives were lost.

Mr. Chairman, as Congress and the administration moves to cut back on America's defense budget, we should be mindful that it was our military which made it possible for the starving people in Somalia to be fed.

They are, without a doubt, the best trained, best equipped, most highly motivated young men and women, coming from all walks of life, a true cross section of America, and they are all volunteers serving their country in a most honorable profession, as a member of the Armed Forces of America.

Mr. Chairman, hundreds of thousands of innocent children and adults would have perished if not for the presence of American troops. As usual, these troops performed magnificently and they deserve our utmost appreciation.

Mr. Chairman, the service of the United States military in Somalia has honored all Americans and I again thank the committee for allowing me the opportunity to offer this amendment on behalf of the entire Congress commending our troops, and I urge the House to approve it unanimously.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to a very respected Member of this Congress, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON].

Mr. HAMILTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and express my personal appreciation to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] for offering this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is exactly right. All of us are exceedingly proud of the role played by the American forces in Somalia. This is a very worthy initiative; I accept it and commend the gentleman for offering it.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

Mr. GILMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by my good friend, the gentleman from New York and a distinguished former member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. SOLOMON, commending our Armed Forces for their outstanding work in Somalia.

Mr. Chairman, when called upon to perform, our Armed Forces have consistently responded in a manner that makes our Nation proud. When asked by then-President Bush to provide a secure environment for the conduct of relief efforts in Somalia, 25,000 men and women of the United States military responded.

In performing their task, they were confronted with a massive human tragedy and uncertain security situation. As the gentleman from New York notes

in his amendment, prior to the deployment of U.S. forces, some 8 million people were considered at risk, with over 300,000 already having died from either civil strife, disease, or famine. Tragically, of the victims, about one-fourth were children under the age of 5.

As a result of our military intervention, the threat of starvation has been dramatically reduced and a secure environment in Somalia has been created. Our U.S. Armed Forces performed an outstanding humanitarian service in Somalia—a service that the armed forces of very few other countries could have performed. Regrettably this feat was not done without cost: There were some killed and wounded, and families were separated. But throughout, the United States Armed Forces maintained their commitment to achieving a more secure future for the Somali people.

Mr. Chairman, for their commitment, dedication, and professionalism, the U.S. Armed Forces deserve the thanks of not only this Congress and the American people, but also of the international community. This amendment is an appropriate means of providing our thanks.

I commend our colleague from New York for offering this amendment and urge our colleagues to support it.

□ 1710

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF], who for 13 years has led a humanitarian effort on behalf of human beings around this world.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. Let me say I am going to get a vote on this.

I had the opportunity to spend a day with the troops in Baidoa, and I think we certainly owe them 15 minutes of our time to vote for this.

No. 2, before we got to Somalia, we spent 2 days in southern Sudan. Let me sensitize the House to this issue, since you are all here waiting for a vote and you can go on and do other things.

The situation in southern Sudan is worse than Somalia. We spent a whole day debating Somalia here, and yet the situation in southern Sudan is worse. There is starvation of Biblical proportions.

We have a cable that the State Department finally declassified, showing that in southern Sudan there is slavery taking place. They are putting women and children onto buses and trucks and exporting them to Libya.

There is no food in southern Sudan. There is no water basically to drink in southern Sudan. There are no NGO's in Sudan. In Somalia, all the NGO's, World Vision, Save the Children, all of them are there, but in southern Sudan there are none.

Unless this Congress faces the issue of what is taking place in southern Sudan where over 750,000 people have

died, and I believe they are being persecuted because they are black and because they are Christian. Because they are black and they are Christian, nobody is focusing on them.

Mr. Chairman, the Congress ought to focus on them and the administration ought to focus on them.

What the administration should do is send a high-level official to go and be active with regard to what is taking place in southern Sudan.

So, Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment and will call for a roll call vote and urge my colleagues to be sensitive to what is taking place in southern Sudan, where hundreds of thousands of people are dying and they are being persecuted. There is no food and there is no water.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge a unanimous vote for this amendment that honors our American troops.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a Member in opposition to the amendment? The Chair hears none.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 181]

AYES—425

Abercrombie	Borski	Cox
Ackerman	Boucher	Coyne
Allard	Brewster	Cramer
Andrews (ME)	Brooks	Crane
Andrews (NJ)	Browder	Crapo
Andrews (TX)	Brown (CA)	Cunningham
Applegate	Brown (FL)	Danner
Archer	Brown (OH)	Darden
Armey	Bryant	de la Garza
Bacchus (FL)	Bunning	de Lugo (VI)
Bachus (AL)	Burton	Deal
Baessler	Buyer	DeFazio
Baker (CA)	Byrne	DeLauro
Baker (LA)	Callahan	DeLay
Ballenger	Calvert	Dellums
Barcia	Camp	Derrick
Barlow	Canady	Deutsch
Barrett (NE)	Cantwell	Diaz-Balart
Barrett (WI)	Cardin	Dickey
Bartlett	Carr	Dicks
Barton	Castle	Dingell
Bateman	Chapman	Dixon
Becerra	Clay	Dooley
Beilenson	Clayton	Doolittle
Bentley	Clement	Dornan
Bereuter	Clinger	Dreier
Berman	Clyburn	Duncan
Bevill	Coble	Dunn
Bilbray	Coleman	Durbin
Bilirakis	Collins (GA)	Edwards (CA)
Bishop	Collins (IL)	Edwards (TX)
Blackwell	Collins (MI)	Emerson
Bliley	Combest	Engel
Blute	Condit	English (AZ)
Boehlert	Cooper	English (OK)
Boehner	Coppersmith	Eshoo
Bonilla	Costello	Evans

Everett	Kolbe	Pombo
Ewing	Kopetski	Pomeroy
Faleomavaega	Kreidler	Porter
(AS)	Kyl	Portman
Fawell	LaFalce	Poshard
Fazio	Lambert	Price (NC)
Fields (LA)	Lancaster	Pryce (OH)
Fields (TX)	Lantos	Quillen
Fligner	LaRocco	Quinn
Fingerhut	Laughlin	Rahall
Fish	Lazio	Ramstad
Flake	Lehman	Rangel
Foglietta	Levin	Ravenel
Ford (MI)	Levy	Reed
Ford (TN)	Lewis (CA)	Regula
Fowler	Lewis (FL)	Reynolds
Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)	Richardson
Franks (CT)	Lightfoot	Ridge
Franks (NJ)	Linder	Roberts
Frost	Lipinski	Roemer
Furse	Livingston	Rogers
Galleghy	Lloyd	Rohrabacher
Gallo	Long	Romero-Barcelo
Gejdenson	Lowey	(PR)
Gekas	Machtley	Ros-Lehtinen
Gerhardt	Maloney	Rose
Gerren	Mann	Rostenkowski
Gibbons	Manton	Roth
Gilchrest	Manzullo	Roukema
Gillmor	Margolies	Rowland
Gilman	Mezvinsky	Roybal-Allard
Gingrich	Markey	Royce
Glickman	Matsul	Rush
Gonzalez	Mazzoli	Sabo
Goodlatte	McCandless	Sanders
Goodling	McCloskey	Sangmeister
Gordon	McCollum	Santorum
Goss	McCrery	Sarpalius
Grams	McCurdy	Sawyer
Grandy	McDade	Saxton
Green	McDermott	Schaefer
Greenwood	McHale	Schenk
Gunderson	McHugh	Schiff
Gutierrez	McInnis	Schroeder
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Schumer
Hall (TX)	McKinney	Scott
Hamburg	McMillan	Sensenbrenner
Hamilton	McNulty	Serrano
Hancock	Meehan	Sharp
Hansen	Meek	Shaw
Harman	Menendez	Shays
Hastert	Meyers	Shepherd
Hastings	Mfume	Shuster
Hayes	Mica	Sisisky
Hefley	Michel	Skaggs
Hefner	Miller (CA)	Skeen
Herger	Miller (FL)	Skelton
Hinchey	Mineta	Slattery
Hoagland	Minge	Slaughter
Hobson	Mink	Smith (IA)
Hochbrueckner	Moakley	Smith (MI)
Hoekstra	Molinar	Smith (NJ)
Hoke	Mollohan	Smith (OR)
Holden	Montgomery	Smith (TX)
Horn	Moorhead	Snowe
Hoyer	Moran	Solomon
Huffington	Morella	Spence
Hunter	Murphy	Spratt
Hutchinson	Murtha	Stark
Hutto	Myers	Stearns
Hyde	Nadler	Stenholm
Inglis	Natcher	Stokes
Inhofe	Neal (MA)	Strickland
Inslee	Neal (NC)	Studds
Istook	Norton (DC)	Stump
Jacobs	Nussle	Stupak
Jefferson	Oberstar	Sundquist
Johnson (CT)	Obey	Sweet
Johnson (GA)	Oliver	Swift
Johnson (SD)	Ortiz	Synar
Johnson, E.B.	Orton	Talent
Johnson, Sam	Owens	Tanner
Johnston	Oxley	Tauzin
Kanjorski	Packard	Taylor (MS)
Kasich	Pallone	Taylor (NC)
Kennedy	Parker	Tejeda
Kennelly	Pastor	Thomas (CA)
Kildee	Paxon	Thomas (WY)
Kim	Payne (NJ)	Thornton
King	Payne (VA)	Thurman
Kingston	Penny	Torkildsen
Klecza	Peterson (FL)	Torres
Klein	Peterson (MN)	Torricelli
Klink	Petri	Towns
Klug	Pickett	Traficant
Knollenberg	Pickle	Tucker

Underwood (GU)	Walsh	Wolf
Unsoeld	Washington	Woolsey
Upton	Waters	Wyden
Valentine	Watt	Wynn
Velazquez	Waxman	Yates
Vento	Weldon	Young (AK)
Visclosky	Wheat	Young (FL)
Volkmer	Whitten	Zeliff
Vucanovich	Wilson	Zimmer
Walker	Wise	

NOES—0
NOT VOTING—12

Bonior	Houghton	Martinez
Conyers	Hughes	Pelosi
Henry	Kaptur	Thompson
Hilliard	Leach	Williams

□ 1733

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Chairman, today we are not only debating the continued presence of the United States military in Somalia, we are also outlining the future role of the world's only superpower in international crisis. The end of the cold war has prompted U.S. policy advisers to rethink our role in the international community. As the leading military superpower, we are in a position to exert tremendous influence in nearly every corner of the world. But this newfound position should not be abused or over used. We must not be understood, as many would say, to be the 911 number for the world.

The resolution before us today continues United States commitment and resolve to implementing peace in the deeply troubled nation of Somalia. While it is true that our presence there was to be limited in scope and time, our original mission, to ensure some form of a lasting peace, is not over. Warlords continue to plunder humanitarian aid and sporadic gunfire and snipers continue to threaten the lives of innocent civilians. Lacking any recognizable, organized government further contributes to the overall confusion and disarray in Somalia.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 is a needed and well-crafted resolution that is in accordance with the law—specifically the War Powers Act of 1973, Public Law 93-148. Seeing as the situation in Somalia remains somewhat unstable, and the lives of all peacekeeping forces, including those of the United States, can be considered to be in danger, the President is required to seek congressional approval before any deployment of significant length. I am pleased to see that President Clinton has done so, and I intend to support him in this effort.

Under the auspices of the United Nations, the United States would retain a small military presence in Somali as part of an overall U.N. peacekeeping effort. Included is a U.S. commanded Quick Reaction Force designed to quell any serious uprisings that U.N. forces may not be capable of dealing with.

Senate Joint Resolution 45 is not an open-ended resolution, as opponents claim. It is clearly written into the bill that U.S. forces are committed for a period of 12 months. After that time is expired, Congress must revisit the issue. Without a vote to continue United States presence in Somalia, United States forces must withdraw. It is my belief that our mission there will be completed within the 12-month time period.

Mr. Chairman, our commitment to peace and stability in Somalia must be strong both in perception and reality. Our allies look toward us for leadership and support in times of crisis. Our resolve to make a change should be unwavering if we expect to have the support and strength of our allies behind us in any future crisis management situations. I urge support for this resolution not only because it is right for Somalia, but also because it is a sound United States foreign policy decision.

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to tell my colleagues that I intend to vote against the pending resolution and to explain my actions.

I believe that our Nation's Founding Fathers intended, and that the Constitution requires, that Congress debate and ultimately approve the positioning of American troops in hostile situations. For this reason, I am pleased to see Congress addressing the question of whether or not American troops should be in Somalia. In fact, I feel that in taking so long to address this situation Congress has reneged on its responsibilities to the Constitution and to the American people.

I would like to state unequivocally that Congress has the right, and indeed the responsibility, to debate and approve any action which would place the lives of American troops in danger. Thus, I support the concept behind this resolution and would encourage all of my colleagues, regardless of their position on the placement of troops in Somalia, to let it be known that they too agree that the law of the land requires that Congress authorize and approve of American troops being placed in a dangerous or hostile situation.

That being said, I would now like to turn to the resolution at hand and the question of American troops being deployed in Somalia. I was opposed to the positioning of 25,000 American troops in Somalia at the time it was proposed in early December 1992, and hindsight has not caused me to change my opinion.

Like everyone else in the world, I became extremely distressed and depressed every time I saw whole families dying of starvation. I was not convinced at the time, however, nor am I now, that American troops were necessary or even obligated morally to intervene.

It is my objection to the positioning of 25,000 United States troops in Somalia in December of 1992 that leads me to vote against this resolution. As I said earlier, however, I support the concept behind the resolution and will continue to urge Congress to take an active role in the placement of U.S. troops in hostile environs as long as I am a Member of Congress. It is the duty and the responsibility of Congress to act in a responsible manner on matters as grave as this; we owe it to our Nation, to our constituents, and to the men and women who have chosen to serve our Nation in the armed services.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendments being in order, the question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendment to the preamble.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble to Senate Joint Resolution 45.

The committee amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY) having assumed the chair, Mr. DARDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 45) authorizing the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia, pursuant to House Resolution 173, he reported the Senate joint resolution back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment?

If not, the Clerk will report the amendment on which a separate vote is demanded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment:

Page 10, after line 13, insert the following new section 4 and redesignate existing sections 4 through 7 accordingly:

SEC. 4. SUPPORT FOR UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES IN SOMALIA.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) prior to United Nations-authorized operations in Somalia, over 300,000 Somalis (including one fourth of the children under the age of five) died due to civil strife, disease, and famine, and at least one-half of Somalia's population of 8,000,000 people, were considered at risk of starvation;

(2) the number of deaths from starvation in Somalia has declined significantly since the arrival of the United States-led force in Somalia; and

(3) the United States contributed immeasurably to the United States-led force in Somalia, including the deployment of over 20,000 members of the Armed Forces and loss of American lives.

(b) COMMENDATION OF U.S. ARMED FORCES.—The Congress commends the United States Armed Forces for successfully establishing a secure environment for the humanitarian relief operations in Somalia.

Mr. WALKER (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5(b) of rule XV, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for a recorded vote, if ordered, on the committee amendment, as amended, immediately following this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 182]

YEAS—419

Abercrombie	Costello	Green
Ackerman	Cox	Greenwood
Allard	Coyne	Gunderson
Andrews (ME)	Cramer	Gutierrez
Andrews (NJ)	Crane	Hall (OH)
Andrews (TX)	Crapo	Hall (TX)
Applegate	Cunningham	Hamburg
Archer	Danner	Hamilton
Army	Darden	Hancock
Bacchus (FL)	de la Garza	Hansen
Bachus (AL)	Deal	Harman
Baessler	DeFazio	Hastert
Baker (CA)	DeLauro	Hastings
Baker (LA)	DeLay	Hayes
Ballenger	Dellums	Hefley
Barcia	Derrick	Hefner
Barlow	Deutsch	Herger
Barrett (NE)	Diaz-Balart	Hinchey
Barrett (WI)	Dickey	Hoagland
Bartlett	Dicks	Hobson
Barton	Dixon	Hochbrueckner
Bateman	Dooley	Hoekstra
Becerra	Doolittle	Hoke
Bellenson	Dornan	Holden
Bentley	Dreier	Horn
Bereuter	Duncan	Hoyer
Berman	Dunn	Huffington
Bevill	Durbin	Hunter
Bilbray	Edwards (CA)	Hutchinson
Bilirakis	Edwards (TX)	Hutto
Bishop	Emerson	Hyde
Blackwell	Engel	Inglis
Bliley	English (AZ)	Inhofe
Blute	English (OK)	Inslee
Boehert	Eshoo	Istook
Boehner	Evans	Jacobs
Bonilla	Everett	Jefferson
Borski	Ewing	Johnson (CT)
Boucher	Fawell	Johnson (GA)
Brewster	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Brooks	Fields (LA)	Johnson, E.B.
Browder	Fields (TX)	Johnson, Sam
Brown (CA)	Flner	Johnston
Brown (FL)	Fingerhut	Kanjorski
Brown (OH)	Fish	Kasich
Bryant	Flake	Kennedy
Bunning	Foglietta	Kennelly
Burton	Ford (TN)	Kildee
Buyer	Fowler	Kim
Byrne	Frank (MA)	King
Callahan	Franks (CT)	Kingston
Calvert	Franks (NJ)	Klecicka
Camp	Frost	Klein
Canady	Furse	Klink
Cantwell	Gallely	Klug
Cardin	Gallo	Knollenberg
Carr	Gejdenson	Kolbe
Castle	Gekas	Kopetski
Chapman	Gephardt	Kreidler
Clay	Geren	Kyl
Clayton	Gibbons	LaFalce
Clement	Gilchrest	Lambert
Clinger	Gillmor	Lancaster
Clyburn	Gilman	Lantos
Coble	Gingrich	LaRocco
Coleman	Glickman	Laughlin
Collins (GA)	Gonzalez	Lazio
Collins (IL)	Goodlatte	Lehman
Collins (MI)	Goodling	Levin
Combest	Gordon	Levy
Condit	Goss	Lewis (CA)
Cooper	Grams	Lewis (FL)
Coppersmith	Grandy	Lewis (GA)

Lightfoot	Parker	Slattery
Linder	Pastor	Slaughter
Lipinski	Paxon	Smith (IA)
Livingston	Payne (NJ)	Smith (MI)
Lloyd	Payne (VA)	Smith (NJ)
Long	Pelosi	Smith (OR)
Lowe	Penny	Smith (TX)
Machtley	Peterson (FL)	Snowe
Maloney	Peterson (MN)	Solomon
Mann	Petri	Spence
Manton	Pickett	Spratt
Manzullo	Pickle	Stark
Margolies-	Pombo	Stearns
Mezvinsky	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Markey	Porter	Stokes
Matsui	Portman	Strickland
Mazzoli	Poshard	Studds
McCandless	Price (NC)	Stump
McCloskey	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McCollum	Quillen	Sundquist
McCrery	Quinn	Swett
McCurdy	Rahall	Swift
McDade	Ramstad	Synar
McDermott	Rangel	Talent
McHale	Ravenel	Tanner
McHugh	Reed	Tauzin
McInnis	Regula	Taylor (MS)
McKeon	Reynolds	Taylor (NC)
McKinney	Richardson	Tejeda
McMillan	Ridge	Thomas (CA)
McNulty	Roberts	Thomas (WY)
Meehan	Roemer	Thornton
Meek	Rogers	Thurman
Menendez	Rohrabacher	Torkildsen
Meyers	Ros-Lehtinen	Torres
Mfume	Rose	Torricelli
Mica	Rostenkowski	Towns
Michel	Roth	Trafficant
Miller (CA)	Roukema	Tucker
Miller (FL)	Rowland	Unsoeld
Mineta	Roybal-Allard	Upton
Minge	Royce	Valentine
Mink	Rush	Velazquez
Moakley	Sabo	Vento
Molinari	Sanders	Visclosky
Mollohan	Sangmeister	Volkmer
Montgomery	Santorum	Vucanovich
Moorhead	Sarpalilus	Walker
Moran	Sawyer	Walsh
Morella	Saxton	Washington
Murphy	Schaefer	Waters
Murtha	Schenk	Watt
Myers	Schiff	Waxman
Nadler	Schroeder	Weldon
Natcher	Shumer	Wheat
Neal (MA)	Scott	Whitten
Neal (NC)	Sensenbrenner	Wilson
Nussle	Serrano	Wise
Oberstar	Sharp	Wolf
Obey	Shaw	Woolsey
Oliver	Shays	Wyden
Ortiz	Shepherd	Wynn
Orton	Shuster	Yates
Owens	Sisisky	Young (AK)
Oxley	Skaggs	Young (FL)
Packard	Skeen	Zeliff
Pallone	Skelton	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—13

Bonior	Hilliard	Martinez
Conyers	Houghton	Thompson
Dingell	Hughes	Williams
Ford (MI)	Kaptur	
Henry	Leach	

□ 1753

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment to the preamble.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate joint resolution.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the Senate joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 243, noes 179, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 183]

AYES—243

Abercrombie	Fingerhut	McKinney
Ackerman	Flake	McNulty
Andrews (ME)	Foglietta	Meehan
Andrews (NJ)	Ford (MI)	Meek
Andrews (TX)	Ford (TN)	Menendez
Applegate	Frank (MA)	Mfume
Bacchus (FL)	Frost	Miller (CA)
Baessler	Furse	Mineta
Barcia	Gedden	Minge
Barlow	Gephardt	Mink
Barrett (WI)	Geren	Moakley
Becerra	Gibbons	Mollohan
Beilenson	Glickman	Montgomery
Berman	Gonzalez	Moran
Bevill	Gordon	Morella
Bilbray	Green	Murphy
Bishop	Gutierrez	Murtha
Blackwell	Hall (OH)	Nadler
Boehert	Hall (TX)	Natcher
Borski	Hamilton	Neal (MA)
Boucher	Harman	Neal (NC)
Brewster	Hastings	Obey
Brooks	Hayes	Oliver
Browder	Hefner	Ortiz
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Orton
Brown (FL)	Hoagland	Owens
Brown (OH)	Hochbrueckner	Pallone
Bryant	Holden	Parker
Byrne	Hoyer	Pastor
Cantwell	Hughes	Payne (NJ)
Cardin	Hutto	Payne (VA)
Carr	Inslee	Pelosi
Chapman	Jefferson	Penny
Clay	Johnson (GA)	Peterson (FL)
Clayton	Johnson, E.B.	Peterson (MN)
Clement	Johnston	Pickett
Clyburn	Kennedy	Pickle
Coleman	Kennelly	Pomeroy
Collins (IL)	Kildee	Poshard
Collins (MI)	Kiecicka	Price (NC)
Condit	Klein	Rahall
Cooper	Kopetski	Rangel
Coppersmith	Kreidler	Reed
Costello	LaFalce	Reynolds
Coyne	Lambert	Richardson
Cramer	Lancaster	Roemer
Darden	Lantos	Rose
de la Garza	LaRocco	Rostenkowski
Deal	Laughlin	Rowland
DeFazio	Lazio	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Lehman	Rush
Dellums	Levin	Sabo
Derrick	Lewis (GA)	Sanders
Deutsch	Lipinski	Sangmeister
Dicks	Lloyd	Sarpalilus
Dingell	Long	Sawyer
Dixon	Lowe	Schenk
Dooley	Maloney	Schumer
Durbin	Mann	Scott
Edwards (CA)	Manton	Serrano
Edwards (TX)	Margolies-	Sharp
Engel	Mezvinsky	Sisisky
English (AZ)	Markey	Skaggs
English (OK)	Martinez	Skelton
Eshoo	Matsui	Slattery
Evans	McCloskey	Slaughter
Fazio	McDermott	Smith (IA)
Fields (LA)	McHale	

Spratt
Stark
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Studds
Stupak
Swett
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Tejeda

Thompson
Thornton
Thurman
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Trafficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Valentine
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer

Washington
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wise
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates

NOES—179

Allard	Goodlatte	Moorhead
Archer	Goodling	Myers
Armey	Goss	Nussle
Bachus (AL)	Grams	Oxley
Baker (CA)	Grandy	Packard
Baker (LA)	Greenwood	Paxon
Ballenger	Gunderson	Petri
Barrett (NE)	Hamburg	Pombo
Bartlett	Hancock	Porter
Barton	Hansen	Portman
Bateman	Hastert	Pryce (OH)
Bentley	Hefley	Quillen
Bereuter	Herger	Quinn
Billakis	Hobson	Ramstad
Bliley	Hoekstra	Ravenel
Blute	Hoke	Regula
Boehner	Horn	Ridge
Bonilla	Huffington	Roberts
Bunning	Hunter	Rogers
Burton	Hutchinson	Rohrabacher
Buyer	Hyde	Ros-Lehtinen
Callahan	Inglis	Roth
Calvert	Inhofe	Roukema
Camp	Istook	Royce
Canady	Jacobs	Santorum
Castle	Johnson (CT)	Saxton
Clinger	Johnson (SD)	Schaefer
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Collins (GA)	Kanjorski	Schroeder
Combest	Kasich	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Kim	Shaw
Crane	King	Shays
Crapo	Kingston	Shuster
Cunningham	Klink	Skeen
Danner	Klug	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Knollenberg	Smith (NJ)
Diaz-Balart	Kolbe	Smith (OR)
Dickey	Kyl	Smith (TX)
Doolittle	Levy	Snowe
Dornan	Lewis (CA)	Solomon
Dreier	Lewis (FL)	Spence
Duncan	Lightfoot	Stearns
Dunn	Linder	Stump
Emerson	Livingston	Sundquist
Everett	Machtley	Talent
Ewing	Manzullo	Taylor (NC)
Fawell	Mazzoli	Thomas (CA)
Fields (TX)	McCandless	Thomas (OR)
Filner	McCollum	Torkildsen
Fish	McCrery	Upton
Fowler	McDade	Vucanovich
Franks (CT)	McHugh	Walker
Franks (NJ)	McInnis	Walsh
Galleghy	McKeon	Weldon
Gallo	McMillan	Wolf
Gekas	Meyers	Young (AK)
Gilchrest	Mica	Young (FL)
Gillmor	Michel	Zeliff
Gilman	Miller (FL)	Zimmer
Gingrich	Molinari	

NOT VOTING—10

Bonior	Houghton	Shepherd
Conyers	Kaptur	Williams
Henry	Leach	
Hilliard	McCurdy	

□ 1811

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Ms. Kaptur for, with Mr. Houghton against.

So the Senate joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the Senate joint resolution was amended so as to read: "Joint Resolution to authorize the use of United States Armed Forces in Somalia to implement United Nations Security Council Resolutions 794 (1992) and 814 (1993)."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPLANATION OF MISSED VOTES

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I was in my congressional district to attend the wake of a long-time dear friend. Had I been here, I would have voted in the following manner:

"Yes" on Roll No. 178, the NIH conference report;

"No" on Roll No. 179, the Gilman substitute on authorizing forces in Somalia;

"No" on Roll No. 180, the Roth amendment on Somalia;

"Yes" on Roll No. 181, the Solomon amendment to commend U.S. Armed Forces;

"Yes" on Roll No. 182, the Solomon amendment;

"Yes" on Roll No. 183, final passage to authorize U.S. forces in Somalia.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1295

Mr. COPPERSMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1295.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorder vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken on Wednesday, May 26, 1993.

REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ACT AUTHORIZATION, FISCAL YEARS 1993 AND 1994

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2128) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for refugee assistance for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2128

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR REFUGEE ASSISTANCE FOR FISCAL YEARS 1993 AND 1994.

Section 414(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1524(a)) is amended by

striking "fiscal year 1992" and inserting "fiscal year 1993 and fiscal year 1994".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. McCOLLUM] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI].

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2128, the bill now under consideration.

GENERAL LEAVE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, this is a short, to the point, yet important measure that would reauthorize appropriations for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 for the Office of Refugee Resettlement in the Department of Health and Human Services.

Since the enactment of the Refugee Act of 1980 the United States has accepted and resettled over 1.3 million refugees from around the world through our formal, refugee admissions process.

In most cases members of refugee populations had little or no time to plan their lives in the United States. They were thrust out of their own countries because of persecution, not because good jobs were available or because they preferred to live with relatives in the United States.

In short, this is a hardship population and, recognizing that, the Refugee Act set up a resettlement system designed to address their unique needs.

Providing an adequate budget for refugee resettlement is productive and actually helps save money in the long run. Cash and medical assistance is provided to refugees so that they may learn English and receive job training. Without resettlement assistance, our public assistance entitlement programs, which already consume a huge percentage of the Federal budget, would swell with the ranks of newly arrived refugees.

The current appropriation for fiscal year 1993 for refugee resettlement is \$381.5 million. However, the administration has determined that this is inadequate to fund the program and has requested a supplemental appropriation of \$15 million for fiscal year 1993.

This supplemental appropriation would allow for the continuation of 8 months of refugee cash and medical assistance. In the absence of this appropriation, cash and medical benefits will be exhausted by July 31, 1993.

The administration has requested \$420 million for fiscal year 1994 to resettle the same number of refugees.

Thus, there should not be a need for a supplemental appropriation next year.

The supplemental appropriations bill recently reported out of the House Appropriations Committee does not contain the additional amount that the administration has asked for.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2128 provides a such sums reauthorization for fiscal years 1993 and 1994. This will remove a potential impediment now facing some Appropriations Committee members who may wish to include supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1993 for this program, but who want the program to be authorized first.

A sum-certain authorization is appropriate in most instances. However, with the change in administrations and with the uncertainty surrounding the private resettlement program, it has been very difficult to put together accurate estimates of exactly how much the program needs.

The current law, which provides authorization for fiscal year 1992, is a such sums authorization, so there is ample precedent for this approach. In fact, a measure identical to H.R. 2128 has been introduced by Senators KENNEDY and SIMPSON in the other body.

Although there are many aspects of our resettlement program that need to be examined, if not changed, the reality is that it will take some time to work out a consensus on the various issues. With passage of the supplemental appropriations bill imminent, it was the committee's judgment that we should move forward with a streamlined and noncontroversial authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, by approving this bill we demonstrate that we are serious about this program and want to see it adequately funded.

For these reasons, I strongly support H.R. 2128 and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2128 reauthorizes funding for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 for refugee assistance pursuant to the Refugee Act of 1980. The bill makes no programmatic changes to the Refugee Act.

The legislation authorizes Federal financial assistance to cover the cost of providing services to newly arrived refugees. These programs strive to integrate new refugees into the American mainstream as quickly as possible by assisting them in achieving economic self-sufficiency. Since the Federal Government controls the presence of refugees in this country, it is only fair that the Federal Government pick up the tab for providing temporary assistance to refugees when they first arrive.

The Judiciary Committee has worked with congressional leaders, the affected States and voluntary agencies to assure necessary funding for this program—without adding to the fiscal burden of State and local governments.

To continue providing the current level of Federal assistance and avoid shifting the refugee burden precipitously to the States, the ad-

ministration needs, and the bill authorizes, a supplemental appropriation of \$15 million for fiscal year 1993. In addition, the administration's budget for fiscal year 1994 requests \$420 million for the refugee program. I am looking forward to working with my distinguished colleague from Kentucky, Chairman BILL NATCHER of the Appropriations Committee to secure sufficient funding. His steadfast support of this program is highly valued.

I wish to thank Congressman ROMANO MAZZOLI, chairman of the Immigration Subcommittee, for his expeditious consideration of the bill, and Congressman BILL MCCOLLUM, the ranking subcommittee member, for his support. I urge the Members to support the reauthorization of this critical program.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2128.

This bill, as the chairman has so aptly put it, simply reauthorizes the Refugee Resettlement Program for the current fiscal year and fiscal year 1994. It makes no changes in the Refugee Resettlement Program as it now operates.

The program, as he stated, is not currently authorized. The 3-year reauthorization bill that the Committee on the Judiciary reported last year was not scheduled for floor consideration prior to adjournment of the 102d Congress.

Although funding for refugee resettlement was appropriated for fiscal year 1993, the \$381 million funding level was \$29 million less than the funding level for fiscal 1992. A supplemental appropriation of about \$15 million is required in order to allow the current resettlement program to continue to the end of this fiscal year. However, it is my understanding that the Committee on Appropriations has indicated it will not approve the administration's request for this supplemental unless the program is reauthorized.

The specific program for which the funding is required provides cash and medical assistance to refugees who are resettled in this country. This particular program benefits refugees who do not qualify for AFDC, supplemental security income, or Medicaid. It is intended to support the refugees until they can become self-sufficient.

If we do not reauthorize the refugee resettlement program, the supplemental appropriation will not be approved. Without the supplemental, cash and medical assistance for refugees will be cut from 8 months to 3 months effective July 1. Any refugee who entered the United States within the last 7 months would immediately become ineligible for assistance.

Some States, such as Florida, would have to shut down their refugee programs, leaving refugees who entered the United States in the last 3 months of the fiscal year with no cash and medical assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly believe that we need to revisit the Refugee Program. I do not think that the author-

ization type of program that now exists is the way it ought to be. We need to work on it. The chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI], and I both think and concur in that fact, but we are not coming before the House today seeking to make those changes. We are simply doing something that needs to be done for the very short term.

It is a very simple bill, not a complicated one, that allows the supplemental appropriations to be put forward that need to be. Then, later on, it is our hope that we will come back through the committee process, revisit the resettlement bill, and the authorization process for refugees in a more complete and thorough fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2128. This bill simply reauthorizes the Refugee Resettlement Program for the current fiscal year and fiscal 1994. It makes no changes in the Refugee Resettlement Program as it now operates.

The program is not currently authorized. The 3-year reauthorization bill that the Judiciary Committee reported last year was not scheduled for floor consideration prior to adjournment of the 102d Congress. Although funding for refugee resettlement was appropriated for fiscal 1993, the \$381 million funding level was \$29 million less than the funding level for fiscal 1992.

A supplemental appropriation of \$15 million is required in order to allow the current resettlement program to continue through the end of this fiscal year. However, the Appropriations Committee has indicated that it will not approve the administration's request for these supplemental funds unless the program is reauthorized.

The specific program for which the funding is required provides cash and medical assistance to refugees who are resettled in this country. This particular program benefits refugees who do not qualify for AFDC, supplemental security income, or Medicaid. It is intended to support the refugees until they can become self-sufficient.

For some refugees, this adjustment does not take long. For others, who must learn English, adapt to a very different culture, and learn a trade or find a job to support themselves and their families, the adjustment takes longer.

The Refugee Act of 1980, which established our current refugee programs, envisioned providing up to 36 months of adjustment assistance. The States were to be reimbursed for their share of AFDC, SSI, and Medicaid costs for refugees who qualified for those programs. Cash and medical assistance, administered through the State governments, was to be provided for refugees who did not qualify for those programs.

Over the years, that period of adjustment assistance has been cut to 18 months, then to 12 months, and then to the current period of 8 months. In 1990, the Federal Government stopped reimbursing States for their share of AFDC, SSI, and Medicaid. The result has been a shift in costs and responsibility from the Federal Government to the States for a program that clearly is a Federal responsibility.

If we do not reauthorize the Refugee Resettlement Program, the supplemental appropria-

tion will not be approved. Without the supplemental, cash and medical assistance for refugees will be cut from 8 months to 3 months, effective July 1. Any refugee who entered the United States within the last 7 months would immediately become ineligible for assistance.

Some States, such as Florida, would have to shut down their refugee programs, leaving refugees who enter the United States in the last 3 months of the fiscal year with no cash and medical assistance.

The refugee resettlement program has been the subject of some controversy in the last couple of years because of proposals to reform the program and shift responsibility to administering resettlement assistance for the States to voluntary agencies. This reform was promoted as enabling more efficient and effective use of refugee resettlement dollars.

While I agree that the refugee resettlement program should be thoroughly reviewed to determine whether there is a better way to administer refugee assistance, we should also acknowledge that some States are doing an excellent job.

I look forward to working with Mr. MAZZOLI, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Law, Immigration, and Refugees, to review the resettlement program and determine what changes may be advisable.

Such an effort cannot be completed until next year, however, which is why I support reauthorizing the program as it currently operates for fiscal 1994 as well as 1993.

H.R. 2128 is a limited, noncontroversial bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCOLLUM. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend for his cooperation, and really all the members of our subcommittee, because really this was done in perhaps a few hours in order to accommodate the House and the Committee on Appropriations. I want to thank the gentleman for his cooperation and to also assure him that it is the intention of the gentleman from Kentucky to get into the aspects of the refugee act which have not been gone into for a decade.

The gentleman will certainly help all of us in proffering suggestions and ideas, and we will have the hearings. I want to thank him for his suggestions.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I know that is the intent of the gentleman, and I very much appreciate that.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2128, to authorize the refugee resettlement program for fiscal years 1993 and 1994.

This is a simple, straightforward piece of legislation. Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act authorizes such sums as may be necessary for the refugee program for fiscal year 1992. Funds for fiscal year 1993 were appropriated but never authorized. H.R. 2128 simply changes the authorized years to 1993 and 1994 to comply with the Appropriations Committee's request for an authorization prior to appropriating a supplemental.

This legislation is needed immediately in order to allow a supplemental appropriation for the Office of Refugee Resettlement to move forward. Without this supplemental, the primary Federal program for refugee resettlement will be cut from 8 months of cash and medical assistance for recipients to 3 months.

Such a cut would be devastating for the refugee resettlement program. When we first set up the program through the Refugee Act of 1980, Congress authorized 36 months of resettlement assistance to help these dispossessed persons adjust and become self-sufficient in their new home.

Over the years, the Federal Government has reduced the cash and medical assistance program from 36 months, to 18 months, then to 12 months, and finally to 8 months. Reducing assistance further to 3 months would be tantamount to bringing these refugees into the United States and abandoning them.

H.R. 2128 does not specify authorized dollar amounts. Last year Congress appropriated \$381 million for fiscal 1993 for refugee resettlement. The supplemental appropriation request, which originally was for \$27 million, is now for \$15 million, for a total fiscal 1993 funding level of \$396 million. The budget request for fiscal 1994 is \$420 million.

These figures are not out of line with the fiscal 1992 funding level of \$410 million. In fact, they represent a significant decrease in the Federal Government's share of responsibility for refugee resettlement from what was envisioned in the Refugee Act of 1980.

H.R. 2128 is a simple bill that is nevertheless vital to the refugee resettlement program. The legislation represents our country's continued commitment to the world's refugees who have no hope of returning safely to their home countries. We are doing the right thing by helping these unfortunate people, and they, in turn, are enriching our culture as contributing members of our society.

I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 2128.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss].

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support, somewhat hesitant support, because Florida is overburdened and undercompensated on its fair share of refugee costs.

Mr. Speaker, over the last 40 years, 1 million refugees have entered the United States by way of the State of Florida. It is estimated that at least 85 percent have settled in Florida and I assure you, the trend has not abated. I rise today in the hope that this reauthorization of the Vital Refugee Resettlement Act will bring a new emphasis on the word "partnership" when we refer to the relationship of the Federal and State governments in refugee resettlement. To quote from a letter sent by the Governors of Florida, Texas, California, New York, and Illinois:

The decision to admit immigrants and refugees is strictly a Federal one and therefore carries with it a firm federal commitment to provide full reimbursement to the states for services provided to the immigrant and refugee population.

Sadly, the reverse is true. The Federal Government has cut back its support—covering

fewer numbers of refugees for a shorter period of time. Large border States have been absorbing the bulk of refugee costs for far too long. While I am happy to say that Florida boasts an exemplary refugee program—pulling together a network of voluntary agencies, mutual assistance associations, State and local governments—there is a growing number of people that we are unable to reach. For the people in our network, we have a welfare dependency rate of under 20 percent—accomplished while keeping our administrative cost rate under 10 percent. All of this has been accomplished without the help of any Federal demonstration grants. Unfortunately, these statistics fall far short of meeting the needs of Florida's refugees who crowd our schools, our hospitals, and our labor force. There are still large numbers of elderly refugees who don't know that they qualify for Medicaid—there are children who are not attending school because their parents don't know that they can attend school without papers. We are facing ignorance and unused talents. Nurses, lawyers, and accountants are doing lawn maintenance, housework, and waiting tables because they do not know of an agency that can help them. These people are ready, willing and able to make a significant contribution to our community but we are unable to facilitate their assimilation. If the Federal Government is going to be a partner in the refugee resettlement challenge facing this country, we must stop funding with inflexible and outdated formulas that direct money to States with few refugees and instead, place the emphasis on the States and the people who need it most.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAZZOLI] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2128.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1820

GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS ACT OF 1993

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 826) to provide for the establishment, testing, and evaluation of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 826

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Performance and Results Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) waste and inefficiency in Federal programs undermine the confidence of the American people in the Federal Government and reduces the Federal Government's ability to address adequately vital public needs;

(2) Federal managers are seriously disadvantaged in their efforts to improve program efficiency and effectiveness, because of insufficient articulation of program goals and inadequate information on program performance; and

(3) congressional policymaking, spending decisions, and program oversight are seriously handicapped by insufficient attention to program performance and results.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are to—

(1) improve the confidence of the American people in the capability of the Federal Government, by systematically holding Federal agencies accountable for achieving program results;

(2) initiate program performance reform with a series of pilot projects in setting program goals, measuring program performance against those goals, and reporting publicly on their progress;

(3) improve Federal program effectiveness and public accountability by promoting a new focus on results, service quality, and customer satisfaction;

(4) help Federal managers improve service delivery, by requiring that they plan for meeting program objectives and by providing them with information about program results and service quality;

(5) improve congressional decisionmaking by providing more objective information on achieving statutory objectives, and on the relative effectiveness and efficiency of Federal programs and spending; and

(6) improve internal management of the Federal Government.

SEC. 3. STRATEGIC PLANNING.

Chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 305 the following new section:

"§ 306. Strategic plans

"(a) No later than September 30, 1997, the head of each agency shall submit to the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Congress a strategic plan for program activities. Such plan shall contain—

"(1) a comprehensive mission statement covering the major functions and operations of the agency;

"(2) general goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for the major functions and operations of the agency;

"(3) a description of how the general goals and objectives contained in the strategic plan are to be achieved, including a description of the operational processes, skills and technology, and the human, capital, information, and other resources required to meet those goals and objectives;

"(4) a description of how the performance goals included in the plan for the agency required by section 1115(a) of title 31 shall be related to the general goals and objectives contained in the strategic plan;

"(5) an identification of those key factors external to the agency and beyond its control that could significantly affect the achievement of the general goals and objectives contained in the strategic plan; and

"(6) a description of the program evaluations used in establishing or revising general goals and objectives contained in the strategic plan, with a schedule for future program evaluations.

"(b) The strategic plan shall cover a period of not less than five years forward from the fiscal year in which it is submitted, and shall be updated and revised at least every three years.

"(c) The performance plan required for an agency by section 1115 of title 31 shall be consistent with the agency's strategic plan. A performance plan may not be submitted for a fiscal year not covered by a current strategic plan under this section.

"(d) When developing a strategic plan, an agency shall consult with the Congress, and shall solicit and consider the views and suggestions of those entities potentially affected by or interested in such plan.

"(e) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently governmental functions. The drafting of strategic plans under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"(f) For purposes of this section the term 'agency' means an Executive agency as that term is defined under section 105, but does not include the Central Intelligence Agency, the General Accounting Office, the Panama Canal Commission, the United States Postal Service, and the Postal Rate Commission.

"(g) For exemptions of agencies from the requirements of this section, see section 1117 of title 31, United States Code."

SEC. 4. ANNUAL PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.

(a) BUDGET CONTENTS AND SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.—Section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(29) beginning with fiscal year 1999, a Federal Government performance plan for the overall budget as provided for under section 1115."

(b) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1114 the following new sections:

"§ 1115. Performance plans

"(a) In carrying out the provisions of section 1105(a)(29), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall require each agency to prepare and submit to the Director an annual performance plan covering each program activity set forth in the budget of such agency. Such plan shall—

"(1) establish performance goals to define the level of performance to be achieved by a program activity;

"(2) express such goals in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form unless authorized to be in an alternative form under subsection (b);

"(3) briefly describe the operational processes, skills, and technology, and the human, capital, information, or other resources required to meet the performance goals;

"(4) establish performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the relevant outputs, service levels, and outcomes of each program activity;

"(5) provide a basis for comparing actual program results with the established performance goals; and

"(6) describe the means to be used to verify and validate measured values.

"(b) If an agency, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, determines that it is not feasible to express the performance goals for a particular program activity in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget may authorize an alternative form. Such alternative form shall—

"(1) include separate descriptive statements of—

"(A) a minimally effective program, or

"(B) such alternative as authorized by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,

with sufficient precision and in such terms that would allow for an accurate, independent determination of whether the program activity's performance meets the criteria of the description; or

"(2) state why it is infeasible or impractical to express a performance goal in any form for the program activity.

"(c) For the purpose of complying with this section, an agency may aggregate or consolidate program activities, except that any aggregation or consolidation may not omit or minimize the significance of any program activity constituting a major function or operation for the agency.

"(d) An agency may submit with its annual performance plan an appendix covering any portion of the plan that—

"(1) is specifically authorized under criteria established by an Executive order to be kept secret in the interest of national defense or foreign policy; and

"(2) is properly classified pursuant to such Executive order.

"(e) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently governmental functions. The drafting of performance plans under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"(f) For purposes of this section, sections 1116 through 1119, and sections 9704 and 9705—

"(1) the term 'agency' has the meaning that term has in section 306(f) of title 5;

"(2) the term 'outcome measure' means an assessment of the results of a program activity compared to its intended purpose;

"(3) the term 'output measure' means the tabulation, calculation, or recording of activity or effort, expressed in a quantitative or qualitative manner;

"(4) the term 'performance goal' means a target level of performance expressed as a tangible, measurable objective, against which actual achievement can be compared, including a goal expressed as a quantitative standard, value, or rate;

"(5) the term 'performance indicator' means a particular value or characteristic used to measure output or outcome;

"(6) the term 'program activity' means a specific activity or project as listed in the program and financing schedules of the annual budget of the United States Government; and

"(7) the term 'program evaluation' means an assessment, through objective measurement and systematic analysis, of the manner and extent to which Federal programs achieve intended objectives.

"§ 1116. Program performance reports

"(a) No later than March 31, 2000, and no later than March 31 of each year thereafter, the head of each agency shall prepare and submit to the President and the Congress, a report on program performance for the previous fiscal year.

"(b)(1) Each report on program performance shall set forth the performance indicators established in the agency performance plan under section 1115, along with the actual program performance achieved compared with the performance goals expressed in the plan for that fiscal year.

"(2) If performance goals are specified in an alternative form pursuant to section 1115(b), the results of such program shall be described in relation to such specifications.

"(c) The report on program performance for fiscal year 2000 shall include actual results for the preceding fiscal year, the report

for fiscal year 2001 shall include actual results for the two preceding fiscal years, and the report for fiscal year 2002 and all subsequent reports shall include actual results for the three preceding fiscal years.

"(d) Each report on program performance shall—

"(1) review the success of achieving the performance goals of the fiscal year covered by the report;

"(2) evaluate the performance plan for the current fiscal year relative to the performance achieved toward the performance goals in each fiscal year covered by the report;

"(3) explain and describe, where a performance goal has not been met—

"(A) why the goal was not met;

"(B) those plans and schedules for achieving the established performance goal; and

"(C) if the performance goal is impractical or infeasible, why that is the case and what action is recommended;

"(4) describe the use and assess the effectiveness in achieving performance goals of any waiver under section 9704 of this title; and

"(5) include the summary findings of those program evaluations completed during each fiscal year covered by the report.

"(e) An agency head may include all program performance information required annually under this section in an annual financial statement required under section 3515 if any such statement is submitted to the Congress no later than March 31 of the applicable fiscal year.

"(f) The functions and activities of this section shall be considered to be inherently governmental functions. The drafting of reports on program performance under this section shall be performed only by Federal employees.

"(g) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115.

"§ 1117. Exemptions

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget may exempt from the requirements of sections 1115 and 1116 of this title and section 306 of title 5, any agency with annual outlays of \$20,000,000 or less.

"(b) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115."

SEC. 5. MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY.

Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 9703 the following new section:

"§ 9704. Managerial accountability and flexibility

"(a) Beginning with fiscal year 1999, the performance plans required under section 1115 may include proposals to waive administrative procedural requirements and controls (other than requirements under section 553 of title 5), including specification of personnel staffing levels, limitations on compensation or remuneration, and prohibitions or restrictions on funding transfers among budget object classification 20 and subclassifications 11, 12, 31, and 32 of each annual budget submitted under section 1105, in return for specific individual or organization accountability to achieve a performance goal. In preparing and submitting the performance plan under section 1105(a)(29), the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall review and may approve any proposed waivers. A waiver shall take effect at the beginning of the fiscal year for which the waiver is approved.

"(b) Any such proposal under subsection (a) shall describe the anticipated effects on performance resulting from greater manage-

rial or organizational flexibility, discretion, and authority, and shall quantify the expected improvements in performance resulting from any waiver. The expected improvements shall be compared to current actual performance, and to the projected level of performance that would be achieved independent of any waiver.

"(c) Any proposal waiving limitations on compensation or remuneration shall precisely express the monetary change in compensation or remuneration amounts, such as bonuses or awards, that shall result from meeting, exceeding, or failing to meet performance goals.

"(d) Any proposed waiver of procedural requirements or controls imposed by an agency (other than the proposing agency or the Office of Management and Budget) may not be included in a performance plan unless it is endorsed by the agency that established the requirement, and any such endorsement shall be included in the proposing agency's performance plan.

"(e) A waiver shall be in effect for one or two years, as specified by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget in approving the waiver. A waiver may be renewed for a subsequent year. After a waiver has been in effect for three consecutive years, the performance plan prepared under section 1115 may propose that a waiver, other than a waiver of limitations on compensation or remuneration, be made permanent.

"(f) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115."

SEC. 6. PILOT PROJECTS.

(a) PERFORMANCE PLANS AND REPORTS.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1117 (as added by section 4 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 1118. Pilot projects for performance goals

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the head of each agency, shall designate not less than ten agencies as pilot projects in performance measurement for fiscal years 1994, 1995, and 1996. The selected agencies shall reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall undertake the preparation of performance plans under section 1115, and program performance reports under section 1116, other than section 1116(c), for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency. A strategic plan shall be used when preparing agency performance plans during one or more years of the pilot period.

"(c) No later than May 1, 1997, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall submit a report to the President and the Congress which shall—

"(1) assess the benefits, costs, and usefulness of the plans and reports prepared by the pilot agencies in meeting the purposes of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993;

"(2) identify any significant difficulties experienced by the pilot agencies in preparing plans and reports; and

"(3) set forth any recommended changes in the requirements of the provisions of Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, section 306 of title 5, sections 1105, 1115, 1116, 1117, 1119 and 9704 of this title, and this section.

"(d) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115."

(b) MANAGERIAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND FLEXIBILITY.—Chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after sec-

tion 9704 (as added by section 5 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 9705. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall designate not less than five agencies as pilot projects in managerial accountability and flexibility for fiscal years 1995 and 1996. Such agencies shall be selected from those designated as pilot projects under section 1118 and shall reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall include proposed waivers in accordance with section 9704 for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency.

"(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include in the report to the President and to the Congress required under section 1118(c)—

"(1) an assessment of the benefits, costs, and usefulness of increasing managerial and organizational flexibility, discretion, and authority in exchange for improved performance through a waiver; and

"(2) an identification of any significant difficulties experienced by the pilot agencies in preparing proposed waivers.

"(d) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115."

(c) PERFORMANCE BUDGETING.—Chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after section 1118 (as added by section 6 of this Act) the following new section:

"§ 1119. Pilot projects for performance budgeting

"(a) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget, after consultation with the head of each agency, shall designate not less than five agencies as pilot projects in performance budgeting for fiscal years 1998 and 1999. At least three of the agencies shall be selected from those designated as pilot projects under section 1118, and shall also reflect a representative range of Government functions and capabilities in measuring and reporting program performance.

"(b) Pilot projects in the designated agencies shall cover the preparation of performance budgets. Such budgets shall present, for one or more of the major functions and operations of the agency, the varying levels of performance, including outcome-related performance, that would result from different budgeted amounts.

"(c) The Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall include, as an alternative budget presentation in the budget submitted under section 1105 for fiscal year 1999, the performance budgets of the designated agencies for this fiscal year.

"(d) No later than March 31, 2001, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget shall transmit a report to the President and to the Congress on the performance budgeting pilot projects which shall—

"(1) assess the feasibility and advisability of including a performance budget as part of the annual budget submitted under section 1105;

"(2) describe any difficulties encountered by the pilot agencies in preparing a performance budget;

"(3) recommend whether legislation requiring performance budgets should be proposed and the general provisions of any legislation; and

"(4) set forth any recommended changes in the other requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993, section

306 of title 5, sections 1105, 1115, 1116, 1117, and 9704 of this title, and this section.

"(e) For definitions applicable under this section, see section 1115."

SEC. 7. CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT AND LEGISLATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting the ability of the Congress to establish, amend, suspend, or annul a performance goal. Any such action shall have the effect of superseding that goal in the plan submitted under section 1105(a)(29) of title 31, United States Code, as amended by this Act.

(b) GAO REPORT.—No later than June 1, 1997, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Congress on the implementation of this Act, including the prospects for compliance by Federal agencies beyond those participating as pilot projects under sections 1118 and 9705 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 8. TRAINING.

The Office of Personnel Management shall, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Comptroller General of the United States, develop a strategic planning and performance measurement training component for its management training program and otherwise provide managers with an orientation on the development and use of strategic planning and program performance measurement.

SEC. 9. RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.

No provision or amendment made by this Act may be construed as—

(1) creating any right, privilege, benefit, or entitlement for any person who is not an officer or employee of the United States acting in such capacity; or

(2) superseding any statutory requirement, including any requirement under section 553 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 10. TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.

(a) AMENDMENT TO TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 305 the following:

"306. Strategic plans."

(b) AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 31, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 11.—The table of sections for chapter 11 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 1114 the following:

"1115. Performance plans.

"1116. Program performance reports.

"1117. Exemptions.

"1118. Pilot projects for performance goals.

"1119. Pilot projects for performance budgeting."

(2) AMENDMENT TO CHAPTER 97.—The table of sections for chapter 97 of title 31, United States Code, is amended by adding after the item relating to section 9703 the following:

"9704. Managerial accountability and flexibility.

"9705. Pilot projects for managerial accountability and flexibility."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill presently under consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, the Government Performance and Results Act is a major step toward reinventing the way our Government operates. With this legislation, we have a unique opportunity to make fundamental changes in the way the Federal Government does business. No longer can we tolerate a structure, culture, and lack of leadership that allows waste and mismanagement to dominate the Federal agencies.

This opportunity is unique for several reasons. Most important, we have a President who is committed to making our Government work more efficiently and effectively. He and his administration strongly support H.R. 826, and have urged its passage.

H.R. 826 will be a force in making fundamental changes in the Federal bureaucracy. The purpose of H.R. 826 is to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of Federal programs by establishing a system to set goals for program performance and to measure results.

Mr. Speaker, rather than justify budgets with abstract bureaucratic actions, we are going to start telling the American people exactly what kind of bang they are going to get for their dollars and hold ourselves accountable when we do not meet our goals. This is a profound cultural change in how our Government operates.

Beginning in 1994 this act requires the Office of Management and Budget to select 10 agencies to perform pilot projects for 3 years on developing strategic plans. These 5-year strategic plans must outline an agency's mission, general goals, and objectives, and include a description of how the goals and objectives will be achieved.

OMB will also select five agencies to perform pilot projects for 2 years on managerial flexibility. The pilots will assess the benefits, costs, and usefulness of increasing managerial and organizational flexibility, discretion, and authority. Managers will be given the opportunity to waive certain administrative procedural requirements, such as, specifying personnel staffing levels, placing limitations on compensation or remuneration, and transferring money between specified accounts, in return for more accountability by line managers. Managers will not be able to supersede any regulatory or statutory requirements under this act.

In 1997, OMB will report to Congress on the pilot projects. Also at that time,

all agencies will begin submitting 5-year strategic plans, and annual performance plans to OMB. At the same time, OMB will select five agencies to begin pilot projects on performance-based budgeting. By the year 2000, all agencies will be submitting annual performance reports with the budget, preparing for the process of performance-based budgeting. OMB will then set forth any recommendations to Congress whether legislation requiring performance budgets should be proposed, and the general provisions of such legislation.

Today, Federal managers are impaired in their efforts to improve program efficiency and effectiveness because of a lack of program goals and performance measurement. As they work to provide services to the public, they feel the budgeter's wrath to perform more with less, while not being given the adequate information or the tools to improve the program. This act will not only give managers critical performance information, but also managerial flexibility, a tool allowing managers to adapt to changing conditions.

Moreover, policymakers will also benefit from measuring a program's performance by allowing authorization and appropriation committees to be able to answer very basic questions: Is this program working? and if not, what will it take to fix it?

This legislation enjoys broad bipartisan support in both Houses of Congress. In addition, the Administration, the General Accounting Office, and many public policy groups, have endorsed H.R. 826. I would like to acknowledge the hard work and efforts of Mr. JOHN CONYERS, the chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and Mr. BILL CLINGER, its ranking minority member, for crafting this legislation and moving it quickly through the process to where it is today.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the last several years have helped the Congress, and more important, the American people understand that we must start expecting more for less from the Federal Government. Among my goals as Republican chairman of the House Government Operations Committee is to help bring efficiency and effectiveness to the Nation's public programs. "Reinventing Government" is how author David Osborne referred to the pioneering of this new form of governance. Simply translated, it is the task of rebuilding faith in the Federal Government's ability to effectively carry out its missions.

The goal of reinventing government takes a giant leap forward today with the consideration H.R. 826, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Under the mandates of this act, Federal program managers will, for the

first time, be asked to document the successes of their programs and, eventually, tie their program's success to their annual budgets. H.R. 826 requires agencies to develop measurable program performance goals and to report their actual progress toward achieving those goals. This would begin with 10 pilot projects and phased in over several years. By the year 2000, all agencies would publish strategic plans, identifying measurable performance goals, and report annually on whether they are achieving those goals and, if not, why not.

Most important, a number of agencies will be tying their success in achieving their performance goals directly to their budget requests. The use of this information in the appropriation process is limitless. Despite the relative lack of press attention this proposal has received, no other legislation will have a greater impact on the lives of Government program managers as the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993.

The key to its success, however, will be Congress' willingness to use this performance data in allocating appropriations. Without a fundamental acceptance of performance measurement goals and achievements by our colleagues on the the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, this entire effort will be for naught.

In addition to calling on our colleagues to support this effort, I also want to express my gratitude to the parties that have worked so hard over so many years to put together this substantial management reform legislation. Namely, U.S. Senator WILLIAM ROTH and his staff pieced together the first versions of this legislation over 4 years ago. Since that time, the Senator has worked tirelessly to promote the creation of a Government performance measurement system.

Shortly after Senator ROTH introduced his original bill, staffs at the General Accounting Office, the Office of Management and Budget, and several executive branch agencies began exploring and experimenting with several forms of performance measurement systems. Indeed, most of the language included in H.R. 826, and the final version of S. 20 in the Senate, was negotiated with the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] during the final days of the Bush administration. To their credit, OMB officials in this administration have also lent support to this effort and have called upon Congress to enact its provisions.

Several of the organizations supporting this bill sent officials to several States and other countries to review their performance measurement practices. The results of these efforts have been a tremendous amount of research material which is now available to agencies to help them in implementing the requirements of H.R. 826.

Finally, as Senator ROTH's legislation was considered in the House, through the language of H.R. 826, Members from both sides of the political aisle stood together for effective Government management reform. Very infrequently has the majority and minority parties stood together in unison as they have in passing this important Government management legislation. It is my hope that this cooperation will be repeated frequently on matters before the Government Operations Committee.

I thank Government Operations Committee chairman, the gentleman from Michigan, [Mr. CONYERS], for bringing this bill to the House floor in such a timely manner and thank my colleagues for their support for this vitally important performance measurement legislation.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 826, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. As we consider this week the tax and spend provisions contained in the reconciliation bill, it is truly refreshing to pause for a moment to actually consider improving how Government works for the American people.

I welcome this bill and the opportunity it represents to train our Government agencies to review, assess, and improve the programs they deliver to our citizens. This issue of improving the delivery of Government service is one personally important to me, as I was a sponsor of similar legislation during my tenure in the New Jersey State Legislature. I also recently introduced my own Government performance review bill, H.R. 2245, which would establish a permanent commission to schedule and direct performance reviews for all major agencies of the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 826 represents an important first step toward improving the efficiency of the Federal bureaucracy. Today, the American people are highly suspicious and increasingly cynical about how their Government spends their hard-earned tax dollars. This legislation can begin to reverse that perception.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the work of Chairman CONYERS and ranking minority member CLINGER for bringing this bill to the floor in an expedited fashion. I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yea" on this needed legislation.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. FRANKS].

Mr. ZELIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 826, the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993. Ever since I was elected to Congress in 1990, I have been fighting to

achieve a government that is more accountable and more responsible to the American taxpayers.

Time and time again, we in Congress hear nightmarish stories of government waste and abuse. We hear about Federal employees who read books all day long—and get paid for it.

We hear about hammers and toilet seats that cost thousands of dollars. We must seek to force Government agencies to do what any business would do—create solid plans of action and analyze past performance.

That is why I am proud to be a cosponsor of Chairman CONYERS' bill to do just that. I hope that this legislation will be the start of a new era in American Government. The Government Performance and Results Act will, for the first time, require Federal agencies to tell the American people what results they have achieved with their tax dollars.

In these days of skyrocketing Federal budget deficits, we must be careful about how we appropriate every penny the Government takes in. We must be absolutely certain that the dollars we are spending are giving us a quality product in return. I believe that this legislation will help us do that.

As a small businessman, I realize how important it is in the private sector to require regular performance reviews. No business in America could survive if it were operated with the reckless fiscal abandon that so often characterizes government programs. I hope to see a Federal Government that operates more like my small businesses.

With this legislation, the Office of Management and Budget [OMB] would help to create pilot projects throughout the Federal bureaucracy. Each of these projects would outline the project's goals and objectives in a 5-year strategy plan. The bill requires the programs to develop concrete plans of action—detailing exactly how the goals will be met.

More importantly, the Government Performance and Results Act requires the pilot programs to generate annual reports explaining the successes and failures in accomplishing each milestone and goal during the past 12 months. The Congress could then use these accountability measures to help determine future funding levels.

In effect, spending for Federal programs would be directly tied to their effectiveness. In so doing, we would finally begin to make government accountable to the people.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress can continue to work with the executive branch to encourage more creativity and responsibility from Federal programs. In these days of fiscal austerity, we all must be willing to conserve the taxpayers' dollars and to seek new ways to achieve more effective government.

H.R. 826, the Government Performance and Results Act, will be the first step toward achieving true accountability in government.

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] that the

House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 826, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the establishment of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE ELECTRONIC INFORMATION ACCESS ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1993

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 564) to establish in the Government Printing Office a means of enhancing electronic public access to a wide range of Federal electronic information.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 564

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Government Printing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993".

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 44, UNITED STATES CODE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 41—ACCESS TO FEDERAL ELECTRONIC INFORMATION

"Sec.

"4101. Electronic directory; online access to publications; electronic storage facility.

"4102. Fees.

"4103. Biennial report.

"4104. Definition.

"§ 4101. Electronic directory; online access to publications; electronic storage facility

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Superintendent of Documents, under the direction of the Public Printer, shall—

"(1) maintain an electronic directory of Federal electronic information;

"(2) provide a system of online access to the Congressional Record, the Federal Register, and, as determined by the Superintendent of Documents, other appropriate publications distributed by the Superintendent of Documents; and

"(3) operate an electronic storage facility for Federal electronic information to which online access is made available under paragraph (2).

"(b) DEPARTMENTAL REQUESTS.—To the extent practicable, the Superintendent of Documents shall accommodate any request by the head of a department or agency to include in the system of access referred to in subsection (a)(2) information that is under the control of the department or agency involved.

"(c) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this section, the Superintendent of Documents shall consult—

"(1) users of the directory and the system of access provided for under subsection (a); and

"(2) other providers of similar information services.

The purpose of such consultation shall be to assess the quality and value of the directory and the system, in light of user needs.

"§ 4102. Fees

"(a) IN GENERAL.—The Superintendent of Documents, under the direction of the Public Printer, may charge reasonable fees for use of the directory and the system of access provided for under section 4101, except that use of the directory and the system shall be made available to depository libraries without charge. The fees received shall be treated in the same manner as moneys received from sale of documents under section 1702 of this title.

"(b) COST RECOVERY.—The fees charged under this section shall be set so as to recover the incremental cost of dissemination of the information involved, with the cost to be computed without regard to section 1708 of this title.

"§ 4103. Biennial report

"Not later than December 31 of each odd-numbered year, the Public Printer shall submit to the Congress, with respect to the two preceding fiscal years, a report on the directory, the system of access, and the electronic storage facility referred to in section 4101(a). The report shall include a description of the functions involved, including a statement of cost savings in comparison with traditional forms of information distribution.

"§ 4104. Definition

"As used in this chapter, the term 'Federal electronic information' means Federal public information stored electronically."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for title 44, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"41. Access to Federal Electronic Information 4101".

SEC. 3. STATUS REPORT.

Not later than June 30, 1994, the Public Printer shall submit to the Congress a report on the status of the directory, the system of access, and the electronic storage facility referred to in section 4101 of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 2(a).

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULES.

(a) OPERATIONAL DEADLINE.—The directory, the system of access, and the electronic storage facility referred to in section 4101 of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 2(a), shall be operational not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) FIRST BIENNIAL REPORT.—The first report referred to in section 4103 of title 44, United States Code, as added by section 2(a), shall be submitted not later than December 31, 1995.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA].

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleagues, Mr. ROSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. ROBERTS, for introducing the identical House bill, H.R. 1328. I am delighted to manage the measure on the floor today.

This bill does the following:

First, the bill provides for online access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the Federal Register, and other publications distributed by the Superintendent of Documents.

Second, it provides for the establishment of an electronic directory of Federal public information stored electronically.

And third, it provides for an electronic storage facility.

In addition, the bill requires the Superintendent of Documents to distribute agency electronic information at the request of the issuing agency.

Fees for access to the directory and the system, including information stored in the electronic storage facility, are required to approximate the incremental cost of dissemination of the information. The one exception is that depository libraries will be able to access the directory, and system provided for in the bill, including the information stored in the electronic storage facility, free of charge.

The bill requires the Public Printer to report on the directory, the system access, and the electronic storage facility not later than December 31 of each odd numbered year. The report is to include an analysis of cost savings in comparison with traditional forms of information distribution.

This bill is, in essence, a test as to whether GPO has the capacity to effectively assist the public in electronically accessing information which it already produces in hard copy, and such other information as an agency may request.

The GPO is directed to achieve the objectives of the bill through cost savings elsewhere in its appropriated funds, so the bill does not authorize additional appropriations.

The timing is right, and I hope all Members will support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following letters:

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1993.

HON. JOHN CONYERS,
Chairman Committee on Government Operations,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your recent letter concerning the Government Printing Office Electronic Information Act of 1993 (H.R. 1328 and S. 564).

This Committee appreciates your Committee's decision not to seek referral of H.R. 1328 and S. 564, so that the bills can be considered by the House of Representatives.

This committee acknowledges that the Federal Register Act was handled by your committee.

With my very best wishes,
Sincerely,

CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, DC, May 25, 1993.

HON. CHARLIE ROSE,
Chairman Committee on House Administration,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHARLIE: Part of H.R. 1328 and S. 564 (identical bills), "The Government Print-

ing Office Electronic Information Access Enhancement Act of 1993," addresses matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Government Operations. The bills, as reported by the Committee on House Administration on April 1, 1993 and May 25, 1993, amend Title 44 to require the Superintendent of Documents to establish a system for public use which allows "online" access to an electronically stored Congressional Record, Federal Register, and other public documents. The bills also direct the Superintendent to establish reasonable fees for access to these documents.

Thus, H.R. 1328 and S. 564 have the effect of amending the Federal Register Act, which governs the printing, content, distribution, and price of the Federal Register. 44 USC section 1504. The Committee on Government Operations has jurisdiction over the Federal Register Act.

As a result of discussions between our two Committees since the filing of the reports, I have agreed not to seek a sequential referral of H.R. 1328 and S. 564 so that the bills can be considered by the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Chairman.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S. 564 is the Senate version of a measure that has moved through both the House and the Senate.

The primary purpose of the bill is to increase the access of the public to public information that the Federal Government holds and to have that access be in electronic form.

This is truly a bipartisan effort to make changes that in our opinion are long overdue.

The gentleman from Wisconsin quite correctly outlined what the bill is going to do. What I want to do for a minute is talk about what the bill is not going to do. There is nothing in the bill that authorizes the Superintendent of Documents to impose conditions or requirements on the creation, dissemination, re-dissemination, use or re-use of Federal electronic information or electronic directories by Federal agencies or the public. We are not creating a clearinghouse, an approval ground, an editing structure. We are creating a through-channel so that the public can access public information.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, nothing in this legislation should be construed so as to authorize an increase in funding. Rather, it is the intent of the committee that the Government Printing Office implement the system of access, the electronic directory, and the electronic storage facility within the current Government Printing Office budget. Such a requirement should compel the Government Printing Office to find cost savings from existing services.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, it is long overdue for the public to have direct electronic access to public information. This bill provides it in an effi-

cient, foolproof, and financially reasonable method.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask my colleagues to approve this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 564.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks, and include therein extraneous material, on S. 564, the Senate bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

DISMISSING THE ELECTION CONTEST AGAINST JAY DICKY

Mr. KLECZKA, from the Committee on House Administration, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 182, Rept. No. 103-109) dismissing the election contest against JAY DICKY, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 182

Resolved, That the election contest of Bill McCuen, contestant, against Jay Dickey, contestee, relating to the office of Representative from the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas, is dismissed.

□ 1840

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 182) dismissing the election contest against JAY DICKY.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary half hour, for the purpose of debate only, to the ranking member of the contested election task

force and the full Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, to provide the House with a little background, on Tuesday, November 3, 1992, the general election for the Fourth Congressional District in the State of Arkansas was held. This is a largely rural district consisting of 26 counties in the southern half of the State.

The initial results of this election had JAY DICKY, the Republican candidate, leading Bill McCuen, the Democrat, by 10,093 votes.

On December 4, 1992, Mr. McCuen filed a notice of election contest with the Clerk of the House, based on two contentions: First, that the ballot and voting machines misled voters, and, second, that defective voting machines produced inaccurate totals.

On December 5, 1992, Mr. McCuen filed an amended notice of election contest with the Clerk, providing additional information and arguments in support of his two initial contentions, and providing documentary evidence and exhibits.

Mr. Speaker, on January 27, 1993, pursuant to House Administration Committee rule 16, the chairman of the committee, Mr. ROSE, created a task force to review the election contest. This task force was charged with reviewing the documentary record, receiving oral arguments, and recommending to the committee the disposition of an election contest filed pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 381 through 396, by Mr. McCuen.

The House is given its authority to judge election returns, primarily from article I, section 5 of the Constitution which provides that: "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own members. * * *." This provision, taken with section 4 or article I, invest in Congress near complete authority to establish procedures and render final decisions relating to the election of its Members.

Although the House could assume complete responsibility for resolving election contests, to date it has declined to do so. Instead, both Chambers have recognized and relied upon State contest and recount procedures to clarify and resolve issues relating to election contests. The State of Arkansas, in this case, however, has chosen not to assert its jurisdiction.

In fact, the Governor of Arkansas, in his letter to the Clerk of the House, certifying the results of the Fourth Congressional District race, stated:

The enclosed certification should not be interpreted as my position on the merits of the contest. In fact, I am greatly disturbed by the apparent defects in the voting machines in Garland County and by the finding of the Garland County Circuit Court that the voting machines have errors and faults.

Thus, it became the House's obligation to resolve this matter.

I was appointed to chair this task force, which also consisted of Mr. THOMAS of California and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. KILDEE.

On Thursday, February 4, the task force met and heard testimony on Mr. DICKY's motion to dismiss the contest. Upon review of the arguments presented by contestant and the contestee, the task force unanimously agreed to recommend dismissal, thus reaffirming JAY DICKY as the duly elected Member of Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, the members of the task force unanimously agreed that the contestant's allegations were not sufficiently specific to put into serious question either the results of the election, or the propriety of the actions of election and other State and local officials in the conduct of the election, so as to justify proceeding further with an election contest.

It should be noted that in contested election proceedings in the House, the contestant always has the burden of specifically alleging, and supporting with documentation, irregularities sufficient to change the outcome of the election. The contestant must also demonstrate that he is entitled to the seat. If the contestant fails to meet this burden, the Committee on House Administration may suggest dismissal of the contest.

On Wednesday, March 17, the full Committee on House Administration concurred in the task force's decision that the contestant failed to sustain his burden with evidence sufficient to overcome a motion to dismiss. It accordingly moved to favorably report an original resolution dismissing this election contest.

It is therefore the finding of the committee that contestee JAY DICKY received the highest number of votes cast in the election and was duly elected by the voters of the Fourth Congressional District of the State of Arkansas.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, about a decade ago I addressed the floor of the House on another contested election. I think it is significant to note the differences between the one we have before us today and that one of a decade ago.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA] correctly pointed out that this was brought to the floor under the Contested Election Act and that we examined the contention of irregularities in the race according to Arkansas law. Over a decade ago, Mr. Speaker, we did not do that. We examined a contest in Indiana brought to the task force by resolution in which a set of rules that

existed nowhere in the world, in any State, and especially in the State of Indiana, was used to examine a series of ballots, and that through sheer force of partisan majority an election that had been certified by the secretary of state of Indiana was overturned. I am pleased to say that today we have an election in front of us that was certified by the secretary of state of Arkansas who, by coincidence, happened to be the opponent in this case, Mr. McCuen. And we examined his contentions about whether or not there were irregularities in the ballots, in the voting machines, and in the manner in which people voted in those voting machines in particular areas.

Mr. Speaker, there was an extensive hearing. Evidence was presented. Numerous questions were asked. Followup information was presented. And the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLECZKA], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KILDEE], and myself exhausted our questions, and to our satisfaction none of the allegations about irregularities in the election were proved. Under the law of the State of Arkansas our colleague, Mr. DICKEY, was duly elected.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with extreme pleasure that I come before the Members today and support the majority in asking unanimous consent to move forward House Resolution 182 which finally puts the election contest against Mr. DICKEY to rest, a contest that never should have been presented, that never had credible evidence to carry it forward, and that put a taint on his election by the people in Arkansas.

The answer is: Mr. DICKEY won the election day, he won on the recount, he won on the challenge in the court, and he won in front of the task force. It seems to me the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] has been certified more than any other Member of the House, that he truly won that election, and it is about time we move forward with saying so formally, and so I am pleased to ask my colleagues to support House Resolution 182.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, after the last comments by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] I am thinking of withdrawing the resolution. Let us keep the hype up for the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY]. But I will not do so, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1850

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on House Resolution 182.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

LYME DISEASE AWARENESS WEEK

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 43) designating the week beginning June 6, 1993, and June 5, 1994, "Lyme Disease Awareness Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], who is one of the chief sponsors of H.J. Res. 92.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of a joint resolution designating the week beginning June 6, 1993 and June 5, 1994, as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week." I would also like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER] for introducing this important resolution.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER has been a leader in our Congressional efforts to educate our Nation with regard to the dangers of Lyme disease.

Lyme disease, as you may know, is transmitted by a small, little-known tick species which have become abundant in a large part of my district. In 1982, there were 60 reported cases of Lyme disease in my district; by 1989, there were 1,731 cases and the actual number may be several times higher. Over the past years the number of reported cases have increased not decreased.

Although Lyme disease was first officially reported just 15 years ago in Lyme, CT, it has fast become the most common tick-borne disease and one of the fastest spreading infectious diseases in the United States. If treated early, the disease can be cured by antibiotic therapy; however, early diagnosis is often thwarted by the disease's resemblance to the Flu and other less dangerous ailments. Indeed, without early treatment, a victim of Lyme disease can expect severe arthritis, heart disease, or neurological complications. Later effects, often occurring months

or years after the initial onset of the disease, include destructive arthritis and chronic neurological disease. If it were not for AIDS, Lyme disease would be the No. 1 infectious disease facing us today.

I believe the primary way to control Lyme disease is by educating the public on how to take precautions against tick bites and by being aware of symptoms associated with the disease.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend the New York Medical College in Valhalla, NY for their extensive, significant Lyme disease research.

I feel June 6, 1993, is an appropriate time to inform the public of Lyme disease and its dangers. As a representative of the people in my district, it is in their best interest to educate them of the dangers involved.

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, as the Member of Congress representing the area with the most cases of Lyme disease in the country, I am delighted that the House is considering legislation that will designate the weeks of June 6, 1993 and June 5, 1994 as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week." The Senate approved identical legislation introduced by Senator JOSEPH LIEBERMAN of Connecticut on March 26, 1993. I appreciate this opportunity to provide my colleagues with some background on this disease, and why the designation of this week is so important.

Lyme disease is a bacterial infection that is spread by the deer tick, which is slightly smaller than the dog tick. Although Lyme disease was first officially reported just 18 years ago in Lyme, Connecticut, it has fast become the most common tick-borne disease and one of the fastest spreading infectious diseases in the United States. Once considered to be a regional problem found in the Northeast, 49 of the 50 states have now reported cases of Lyme disease.

The deer tick lives in grasses along the shore, in fields, and at the edge of woodlands. Many people on eastern Long Island have expressed concern about going to the beach, taking a walk in the woods, or sitting in their own backyard for fear of getting this debilitating disease.

Many people never even know that they have been bitten by a tick. The parasite can attach itself, feed, detach itself and lay its eggs all without the host's knowledge. In addition, due to its ability to mimic the symptoms of other ailments, a person may be left clueless as to the cause of his or her ailment. Lyme disease is often mistaken for other illnesses such as ringworm, influenza, arthritis, or heart disease. However, if left untreated Lyme disease can cause partial facial paralysis, meningitis, encephalitis, and abnormal slowing of the heartbeat, severe headaches and depression, destructive arthritis, memory loss, and chronic fatigue.

As early treatment of Lyme disease is the key to warding off its worst effects, and as there is currently no vaccine for Lyme disease, the best defense against it is prevention. That is why education is vital if we are to minimize the effects of this painful disease. The American public must know what to look for if they are to take precaution against this disease.

Symptoms of Lyme disease in its early stages include a characteristic rash at the site of the tick bite, headaches, fever, pains in joints, and swollen glands. However, a person might not develop the tell-tale rash at the site of the tick-bite, leaving the person puzzled as to the cause of such a rash. Moreover, standard blood tests often do not reveal the presence of Lyme disease.

The key words in combating Lyme disease are "protect and check," "protect" meaning to protect yourself by wearing protective clothing and repellents and "check" meaning check yourself, your children and your pets as soon as you get home. Checking is important because most experts believe the tick must be attached for more than 24 hours to transmit the disease.

In addition, I am pleased to announce that a permethrin-based repellent which has been approved by the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] is now available to the public. This spray must be used only on clothing not on the skin. The spray, used in combination with a long-acting Deet-based lotion on the skin, can provide very effective protection against the tick and Lyme disease.

Mr. Speaker the prevention of Lyme disease depends upon public awareness. I want to thank my colleagues for their support in bringing this disease to the attention of the American public. It is my hope that the designation of the weeks of June 6, 1993 and June 5, 1994 as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week" will help to make the general public and health care professionals more knowledgeable about Lyme disease and its symptoms.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

S.J. RES. 43

Whereas Lyme disease (borreliosis) is spread primarily by the bite of four types of ticks infected with the bacteria *Borrelia burgdorferi*;

Whereas Lyme disease-carrying ticks can be found across the country—in woods, mountains, beaches, even in our yards, and no effective tick control measures currently exist;

Whereas infected ticks can be carried by animals such as cats, dogs, horses, cows, goats, birds, and transferred to humans;

Whereas our pets and livestock can be infected with Lyme disease by ticks;

Whereas Lyme disease was first discovered in Europe in 1883 and scientists have recently proven its presence on Long Island as early as the 1940's;

Whereas Lyme disease was first found in Wisconsin in 1969, and derives its name from the diagnosis of a cluster of cases in the mid-1970's in Lyme, Connecticut;

Whereas forty-nine states reported more than forty thousand cases of Lyme disease from 1982 through 1991;

Whereas Lyme disease knows no season—the peak west coast and southern season is November to June, the peak east coast and northern season is April to October, and victims suffer all year round;

Whereas Lyme disease, easily treated soon after the bite with oral antibiotics, can be

difficult to treat (by painful intravenous injections) if not discovered in time, and for some may be incurable;

Whereas Lyme disease is difficult to diagnose because there is no reliable test that can directly detect when the infection is present;

Whereas the early symptoms of Lyme disease may include rashes, severe headaches, fever, fatigue, and swollen glands;

Whereas if left untreated Lyme disease can affect every body system causing severe damage to the heart, brain, eyes, joints, lungs, liver, spleen, blood vessels, and kidneys;

Whereas the bacteria can cross the placenta and affect fetal development;

Whereas our children are the most vulnerable and most widely affected group;

Whereas the best cure for Lyme disease is prevention;

Whereas prevention of Lyme disease depends upon public awareness; and

Whereas education is essential to making the general public, health care professionals, employers, and insurers more knowledgeable about Lyme disease and its debilitating side effects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the week beginning June 6, 1993, and June 5, 1994, is designated as "Lyme Disease Awareness Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL TRAUMA AWARENESS MONTH

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 135) to designate the months of May 1993 and May 1994 as "National Trauma Awareness Month," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, trauma means injury, any type of injury, accidental or intentional. Tragically, 140,000 Americans die from injuries each year, more often from motor vehicle crashes than from any other cause. Injuries kill more Americans aged 1 through 34 than all diseases combined and cause the loss of more working years of life than all forms of cancer and heart disease combined. One out of every eight hospital beds is occupied by an injured patient.

The costs of trauma care are astronomical. Over \$110 billion a year is lost in medical ex-

penses, wages, productivity and disability trauma can strike anyone at any time, and the price it exacts in the agony of its victims and the grief experienced by families is immeasurable.

But we are not powerless in our struggle to overcome the causes of this medical problem. We cannot always prevent it but we can minimize the occurrences and maximize the availability of treatment by increasing public awareness of the problem.

Congress, in passing this resolution, will provide the necessary national focus to better enable trauma organizations to mount campaigns to educate our citizens about trauma, its implications and the best solutions to address it.

I fully support passage of this resolution.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 135

Whereas more than 9,000,000 individuals in the United States suffer traumatic injury each year;

Whereas traumatic injury is the leading cause of death for individuals under 44 years of age in the United States;

Whereas every individual is a potential victim of traumatic injury;

Whereas traumatic injury often occurs without warning;

Whereas traumatic injury frequently renders its victims incapable of caring for themselves;

Whereas past inattention to the causes and effects of trauma has led to the inclusion of trauma among the most neglected medical conditions in the United States;

Whereas it is estimated that the people of the United States will spend more than \$175,000,000,000 this year on the problem of trauma;

Whereas trauma is preventable and increased efforts to prevent trauma would reduce or eliminate deaths and disability due to trauma;

Whereas the problem of trauma can be remedied only by prevention and treatment through emergency medical services and trauma systems; and

Whereas the people of the United States must be educated in the prevention and treatment of trauma and in the proper and effective use of emergency medical systems; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That May 1993 and May 1994 are each designated as "National Trauma Awareness Month" and the President is authorized and directed to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe these months with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Commit-

tee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 78) designating the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, as "Emergency Medical Services Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I would simply like to inform the House that the minority has no objection to the legislation now being considered.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of House Joint Resolution 78, legislation I introduced to designate the week beginning May 23, 1993, and the week beginning May 15, 1994, as Emergency and Medical Services Week. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri, BILL CLAY, chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for his support of House Joint Resolution 78, and his help in bringing this legislation to the floor.

Since its inception in 1986, Emergency Medical Services Week has afforded the public with an important opportunity to learn about the life saving benefits of emergency medical care. The demand for emergency medical services is increasing along with rising costs. Many rural and urban hospitals and trauma centers across the Nation have been forced to close because of the increase in costs. EMS systems are overburdened and nearly all are underfunded. Many emergency departments are having difficulty recruiting and retaining health care professionals. Despite these problems, recent advances in emergency medical technologies are enabling EMS providers to save more lives than ever before.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution has the strong support of many National Health Care Organizations including the American College of Emergency Medical Physicians, the International Association of Fire Chiefs, the National Association of Emergency Medical Technicians, the American Ambulance Association, the Association of Air Medical Services, the Emergency Nurses Association, the National Association of State EMS Directors, and the National Council of State EMS Directors and the National Council of State EMS Training Coordinators.

Every year during Emergency Medical Services Week, these groups and communities across the Nation sponsor special events designed to increase awareness and promote prevention of medical emergencies. Emergency Medical Services Week programming has included a variety of health safety topics such as instruction in CPR, alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment, child safety, bicycle safety, and school based educational programs in emergency medicine.

Mr. Speaker, EMS providers are skilled and dedicated individuals ready to provide lifesaving assistance every day. They dedicate countless hours to training and working in cities and communities across the country. Emergency Medical Services Week is necessary to increase public knowledge about emergency medicine.

Again, I want to thank Chairman CLAY for his help in bringing this resolution to the floor and I urge its immediate passage.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 78

Whereas emergency medical services is a vital public service;

Whereas access to quality emergency care dramatically improves the survival and recovery rate of those who experience sudden illness or injury;

Whereas efforts to establish emergency medicine as a medical specialty began 25 years ago with the founding of the American College of Emergency Physicians in 1968;

Whereas the members of emergency medical services teams are ready to provide lifesaving care to those in need 24 hours a day, 7 days a week;

Whereas emergency medical services teams consist of emergency physicians, emergency nurses, emergency medical technicians, paramedics, firefighters, educators, administrators, and others;

Whereas approximately 75 percent of all emergency medical services providers are volunteers;

Whereas the members of emergency medical services teams, whether career or volunteer, engage in thousands of hours of specialized training and continuing education to enhance their lifesaving skills;

Whereas Americans benefit daily from the knowledge and skills of these highly trained individuals;

Whereas it is appropriate to recognize the value and the accomplishments of emergency medical services providers by designating Emergency Medical Services Week; and

Whereas the designation of Emergency Medical Services Week will serve to educate all Americans about injury prevention and how to respond to a medical emergency: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the weeks beginning May 23, 1993, and May 15, 1994, are designated as "Emergency Medical Services Week" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such weeks with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on Senate Joint Resolution 43, House Joint Resolution 135, and House Joint Resolution 78.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the order of the 60-minute special orders granted for today to Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. ARCHER of Texas be switched.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

HOURLY MEETING ON WEDNESDAY NEXT AND THURSDAY NEXT

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. tomorrow, and that when the House adjourns tomorrow, it adjourn to meet at 11 a.m. on Thursday, May 27, 1993.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

REALLOCATION OF TIME FOR SPECIAL ORDER TODAY

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the special order for the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR] on May 25, 1993, be allocated to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

CHANGE OF TIME FOR SPECIAL ORDER TODAY

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to change the 60-minute special order today, for Hon. BARBARA-ROSE COLLINS to a 5-minute special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

□ 1210

NAFTA AND DRUGS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the front page of the New York Times yesterday said it all—illicit drug trafficking is indeed intertwined with the proposed NAFTA trade agreement with Mexico. Every American who is concerned about the destruction illegal drugs wreak every day in our country must read this article.

The Times reports that Mexico's cocaine smugglers, working with Colombian drug cartels, are buying maquiladora factories just south of our border, as well as warehouses and fleets of trucks, to use as front operations for drug-running if this deal goes into effect.

Trade negotiators committed an appalling oversight when they neglected even to discuss the illegal drug trade, in spite of repeated urgings by Members of Congress. After all, 50 to 70 percent of the cocaine consumed in our country comes from Mexico.

Congress should not approve the NAFTA deal unless our borders are locked tight from drug runners.

For the RECORD I include the following New York Times article from May 24, 1993:

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1993]

FREE-TRADE TREATY MAY WIDEN TRAFFIC IN DRUGS, U.S. SAYS

(By Tim Weiner with Tim Golden)

WASHINGTON, May 23.—Cocaine smugglers working with Colombian drug cartels are starting to set up factories, warehouses and trucking companies in Mexico to exploit the flood of cross-border commerce expected under the North American Free Trade Agreement, United States intelligence and law-enforcement officials say.

The Mexican smugglers are buying and setting up the companies "as fronts for drug trafficking," said a report written by an intelligence officer at the United States Embassy in Mexico City. The phenomenon was confirmed by a senior United States official who oversees enforcement of antidrug laws and who spoke on condition that he not be named.

The cocaine traffickers "intend to maximize their legitimate business enterprises within the auspices of the new U.S.-Mexico free trade agreement," the report said. The report was released under the Freedom of Information Act to the National Security Archive, a private research group in Washington that seeks to declassify Government documents.

TAKING ADVANTAGE OF ADVANTAGE

The document said traffickers planned to invest in trucking and warehousing businesses in Mexico as conduits for drug shipments. They have also started to buy manufacturing and assembly plants known as maquiladoras as fronts for drug shipments, the senior United States official said.

Under a program established in 1965, the maquiladoras have special tariff exemptions, and the goods they produce move in and out of the United States with minimal inspection.

"A lot of intelligence demonstrates the drug traffickers' ties to maquiladoras," the United States official said. "They are investing in these plants for shipments to the United States."

United States investigators said that they first noted the phenomenon 16 months ago and that the problem was growing; Mexican officials, who first heard of it six weeks ago from their United States counterparts, said they knew of only a few such cases.

The intelligence report, intended mainly as a warning, did not specify how widespread the problem was or which companies the smugglers were investing in. Law enforcement officials on both sides of the border

said they did not know the scope of the threat.

"The free-trade agreement makes the United States more accessible and convenient for traffickers," said a United States official involved in fighting drug traffickers. "It gives these people better opportunities to smuggle drugs."

The trade agreement, which was signed in December by President Bush, President Carlos Salinas de Gortari and Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, awaits approval by Congress and by the legislatures of Mexico and Canada. Over the next 15 years, it would gradually eliminate tariffs on goods traded among the three nations and eventually allow Mexican truckers to drive their rigs anywhere in the United States and Canada.

A trade expert and two former United States trade negotiators said that while United States and Mexican officials had foreseen the possibility that drug traffickers would take advantage of the trade pact, the problem was not raised during the negotiations. In fact, the pact does not address law enforcement issues related to trade.

WHY IT WASN'T TALKED ABOUT

"This was in the 'too hot to handle' category," said Gary Hufbauer, a senior fellow at the Institute for International Economics and co-author of a favorable book about the trade pact. "It's a painfully obvious problem. The huge increases in traffic will provide a huge cover for drug traffickers."

The challenges facing customs inspectors are already daunting. Mexican smugglers working with the Medellín and Cali drug cartels in Colombia already ship 50 percent to 70 percent of the cocaine consumed in the United States, hauling roughly 200 tons a year over the border and pocketing billions of dollars in profit.

The maquiladoras have grown over the past decade into Mexico's most important source of foreign exchange after oil. More than 2,100 maquiladoras employ half a million workers to make components or finished products from materials that are allowed into Mexico duty-free. The products, from furniture and television sets to auto parts, are shipped back by truck or train, with duty payments only on the value added in Mexico.

A senior Mexican law enforcement official, speaking on condition that he not be named, said the United States officials' warning could "definitely" be well founded.

He said officials were investigating a report of a cocaine shipment hidden in electronics components, although he had not confirmed that any specific maquiladora was being used to smuggle drugs.

Since Mexico deregulated its trucking industry in 1989, each maquiladora has been allowed to operate its own truck fleet and set up its own trucking company. That alone might make them attractive to smugglers.

"The issue of the maquilas is a new one," the Mexican official said. "There is no hard evidence, but these guys are not stupid, and the path is very clear."

A senior Mexican customs official who, following the policy of the Finance Secretariat, also spoke on the condition that he not be named, said maquiladora commerce was being treated deferentially on both sides of the border. He said that the United States Customs Service has the right to inspect the plants and their shipments, but that in practice such checks were rare.

"I think the controls will, naturally, get looser" under the free-trade pact, the Mexican customs official said. "Control will be reduced."

Thus free-trade pact is likely to complicate life for customs supervisors like Bill Lackey in El Paso.

At Mr. Lackey's post on Friday, a line of tractor-trailers spewing diesel fumes stretched for a quarter of a mile across the Bridge of the Americas into Ciudad Juárez, Mexico, waiting for inspections by the two officials on duty.

About 1,700 trucks cross the bridge over the Rio Grande each day, almost all from maquiladoras making textiles and electronic components. Inspections last as little as five minutes.

CONFLICTING GOALS AT BORDER

"We understand they have to get in and get out," Mr. Lackey said. "That is their living. We respect each other. The people coming across understand our problems and adapt to that."

Customs officials are torn between the goals of stopping contraband and supporting commerce. Today "most trucks that go through customs go through almost unimpeded," said Mike Lane, the deputy customs commissioner at El Paso.

But he said 300 new inspectors and new surveillance gear at the 22 customs posts between the Pacific and the Gulf of Mexico would help ferret out the smugglers.

Others familiar with the cocaine trade express doubts.

"The passage of Nafta will clearly put additional strain on customs at the borders," said Assistant United States Attorney Glenn MacTaggart, who prosecuted members of the so-called Juárez cartel, one of the Mexican syndicates cited in the intelligence report.

THE 21-TON CACHE

The Juárez cartel imported the biggest cocaine cache ever seized in the United States, a 21-ton supply found in 1989 in a warehouse near Los Angeles.

"If Nafta provides opportunity for legitimate businesses, it may clearly provide opportunities for illegitimate businessmen," Mr. MacTaggart said. "It's almost common sense."

Under the trade agreement, the export of Mexican products in Mexican trucks would vastly expand. Today, a tractor-trailer truck owned by a Mexican company cannot travel beyond a narrow commercial zone near the border, and trailers are transferred there to American haulers. If the pact is approved, a Mexican trucker will be able to travel to any point in California, Arizona, New Mexico and Texas by 1997, and anywhere in the United States and Canada by 2001.

American law-enforcement officials said they believed the cocaine belonged to a businessman who owns one of the biggest trucking companies in Mexico.

CONTINUED RESTRICTIONS ON EXTENSION OF MFN FOR CHINA

(Mr. WOLF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is expected to request an extension of most-favored-nation status for China. I don't know exactly what conditions the President plans to place on MFN, but they must include an end to MFN if China continues to export slave labor made goods.

Those who believe that the collapse of the Soviet Union brought an end to forced labor and gulag-style prisons are quite mistaken; I know firsthand that the Laogai system is alive and flourishing in China.

In 1991, I visited Beijing Prison No. 1 with the hopes of meeting some of the prodemocracy demonstrators imprisoned there after the Tiananmen Square massacre. I was not allowed to see the demonstrators, but I did find an active prison industry, where workers toiled in unsafe conditions to manufacture socks and other textile products which were exported to the United States. If every Member of Congress witnessed what I did, I suspect very few would support extension of MFN for China.

Last week, I joined with my colleagues NANCY PELOSI, CHRIS SMITH, and CHARLIE ROSE at a press conference where shocking new information was made public about China's continued practice of slave labor exports.

Harry Wu, of Stanford University, recently brought this new information to light. Harry, who spent 19 years as a slave laborer in China's gulag, known as Laogai, has risked his life to try to stop the export of slave labor made goods and has found that American companies are knowingly importing slave labor made goods from China.

China right now enjoys an \$18 billion trade surplus with the United States and Chinese leaders in the past have boasted that the Laogai system generates at least \$100 million a year in exports. But there should be no misunderstanding, MFN for China is fundamentally a moral issue, not an economic one. Whether the Chinese Government is making \$100 million or \$1 by exporting these goods, it is immoral for the United States to prop up this inhumane system.

To allow the Chinese to continue to export to the United States goods made in these dismal prisons by innocent people—many whose only crime is that they stand for freedom—cuts against the grain of everything our Nation stands for.

President Clinton must demand an end to slave labor in China before MFN is approved.

I include for the RECORD the Laogai Research Foundation press release of May 18, 1993, on the subject:

CHINESE GOVERNMENT LIES ABOUT FORCED LABOR PRODUCTS REVEALED AMERICAN COMPANY IS THE SOLE AGENT FOR LAOGAI CAMP

Chinese government statements over the past two years claiming forced labor products are not exported were shown to be lies today at a press conference held on Capitol Hill by Hongda Harry Wu, Executive Director of the Laogai Research Foundation.

"Chinese government officials have not only lied to the world, but they have made an extraordinary effort to hide the continued export of slave labor products to the United States," Wu, a former political prisoner, said in reporting on the Foundation's three-month investigation.

Joined by Congressmen Frank Wolf and Charles Rose, Wu released a detailed report entitled: "Cruel Money: Who Profits from China's Laogai Products?"

The most important findings of the investigation are:

Columbus McKinnon Corp. (Amherst, NY) was named by a Chinese government trading company as the "sole agent" in the United States for chain and lever hoists manufactured by Zhejiang Province No. 4 Prison, also known as Hangzhou Superpower Hoist and Hangzhou Wulin Machinery Plant. The illegal hoists carry the CM brand and are on sale throughout the United States.

Zhejiang Province No. 1 Prison which is known as Wuyi (May 1st) Machinery Plant and Zhejiang Light Duty Lifting Machinery Factory is exporting chain and lever hoists to the U.S. through a Chinese government-owned trading company, Fuchuen Machinery & Equipment Import and Export Corp., operating in Hong Kong.

At a trade show held in Los Angeles in March, Chinese officials not only tried to sell a diesel engine banned by the U.S. Customs Service, they sought foreign investment in the Laogai factory.

A photograph from an official Chinese government publication purporting to show executives of Dow Chemical meeting with officials of Shenyang No. 1 Laogai (Labor Reform) Detachment, a prison producing rubber vulcanizing chemicals known as "accelerators." The executives are believed to be from Dow Chemical Pacific Ltd., a Dow subsidiary based in Hong Kong with branch offices in China.

Documentary evidence showing the chemical Laogai produces half of China's total output of rubber vulcanizing "accelerators." The implication of this is staggering—half of all Chinese rubber and rubber-related products might be illegal under U.S. law.

Another prison in Shenyang (No. 2 Laogai Detachment) produces millions of pairs of rubber boots, many of which are exported to the U.S.

Discussions with officials of Chinese state-owned trading companies in Hong Kong revealed the practice of mixing illegal forced labor products with legal products of the same brand name is expanding, thus making U.S. law enforcement efforts much more difficult. The products in question are handtools which may be coming into Texas.

The three-month investigation involved repeated trips inside China by a number of persons associated with the Laogai Research Foundation. Photographs taken on these trips of various Laogai camps are believed to be the first to appear in public inside or outside China.

Wu was for 19 years a political prisoner in many different Laogai camps. His secret filming inside 20 camps in 1991 resulted in major exposes on 60 Minutes and in Newsweek. He has testified before committees of both the Senate and House of Representatives, and is the author of Laogai—The Chinese Gulag, published in 1992 by Westview Press.

The Laogai Research Foundation is a non-profit organization dedicated to exposing human rights abuses in China's vast gulag. Wu was joined at the press conference by Jeffrey Fiedler, a director of the Foundation and Secretary-Treasurer, Food and Allied Service Trades Department, AFL-CIO.

CRISIS IN HAITI

(Mr. OWENS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, the drug smuggling generals of Haiti are again laughing at U.S. and U.N. diplomats.

They rejected another proposal. I quote from the New York Times of today:

After 2 days of talks and a month of intense diplomatic pressure, Haiti's military authorities have rejected an American-backed United Nations plan to deploy an international police force here as part of a settlement of Haiti's long political crisis * * *

The rejection was delivered to President Clinton's special adviser for Haitian affairs, Lawrence Pezzullo, and the United Nations special envoy to Haiti, Dante Caputo.

Mr. Speaker, I include this entire article for the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 25, 1993]

LEADERS IN HAITI SPURN POLICE PLAN

(By Howard W. French)

PORT-AU-PRINCE, HAITI, May 24.—After two days of talks and a month of intense diplomatic pressure, Haiti's military authorities have rejected an American-backed United Nations plan to deploy an international police force here as part of a settlement of Haiti's long political crisis, diplomats said today.

The rejection was delivered to President Clinton's special adviser for Haitian affairs, Lawrence Pezzullo, and the United Nations special envoy to Haiti, Dante Caputo. It came after American diplomats expressed strong confidence in recent days that army leaders would accept the return of the country's elected President, the Rev. Jean-Bertrand Aristide.

Diplomats said the rejection set the stage for new economic and other sanctions against Haiti, which would be aimed at the military leaders and their supporters among the country's small elite.

Under the plan for the negotiated return of Father Aristide, he had agreed to an amnesty for the military leaders in the September 1991 coup and the subsequent political violence that has claimed as many as 3,000 lives.

'NO OTHER CHOICE'

A proposal to deploy 500 international police officers, which has encountered resistance from both military leaders and some Aristide supporters, was intended to help end the violence and to create a climate for negotiations on a new government and a deadline for the exiled President's return.

With the rejection, diplomats here said Haiti's military authorities had called the bluff of the United Nations and Washington, which have warned of serious new sanctions if diplomacy fails.

"We told them that they had left no possibility for the international community to end this crisis but to impose sanctions," said a diplomat close to the discussions. "We don't want to do this, but it was made absolutely clear that at this point there is no other choice."

Another diplomat said. "There are two sides to this thing, naturally, but so far we have only heard the details of one of them"—a large international aid package being prepared for Haiti in expectation of a settlement. "It's time to begin talking seriously about the pain," the diplomat said.

PUNITIVE MEASURES SUGGESTED

Since shortly after the coup, which forced Father Aristide into exile, there has been a hemispheric embargo on Haiti, but has failed to sway the Haitian elite. At the same time, however, the embargo has wreaked severe long-term damage to Haiti's economy and caused added pain for the bulk of the popu-

lation in what had already been the hemisphere's poorest country.

Some diplomats here mentioned several possible punitive measures, including the prosecution of army leaders who are widely believed to be involved in narcotics trafficking, the blocking of petroleum shipments and the freezing of financial assets of supporters of the coup.

Adding to the pressure for sanctions, diplomats close to the negotiations here have said the United Nations has recently indicated that it will withdraw from the diplomacy here in the absence of support for strong punitive measures that can persuade the Haitian Army to move toward a resolution.

The United Nations special mediator for Haiti, Mr. Caputo, a former Argentine Foreign Minister, has made six trips here in recent weeks to seek an international settlement.

FRUSTRATION IS EXPRESSED

With great expectations of a breakthrough, fed by confident assessments from American diplomats, expressions of frustration toward the United States were common among diplomats here today.

"For weeks, the Americans have been telling everyone that the army is in agreement, that everything is in place," one said. "Then we come down here and see that there is nothing to it, absolutely nothing."

"Washington has one more opportunity to show that it is serious about settling this thing in a multilateral fashion, through sanctions. Otherwise, everyone else is going to withdraw and this is going to become an American problem again, all by itself."

But another diplomat close to the talks said that Mr. Clinton's special representative, Mr. Pezzullo, had "spoken very strongly" in warning the army leaders today, leaving "no doubt about where the Americans stand."

Mr. Speaker, this senseless, continuous negotiation with drug smugglers who will never yield their profits must cease. The Congressional Black Caucus has adopted a position that we should tighten the sanctions on Haiti, we should proceed and demand that President Aristide be returned in 60 days, that by July 12 President Aristide should be returned to Haiti.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. BARTLETT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

□ 1900

UNITED STATES AND PAKISTAN RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McNULTY). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Michigan [Miss COLLINS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise to discuss an issue imperative to United States foreign policy—United States and Pakistan relations.

Mr. Speaker, we currently face a crossroad between our Nation's relationship with one of our longtime allies, Pakistan.

The State Department is considering classifying Pakistan as a terrorist state because of allegations that Pakistan has given material, weapons, personnel, and training support to Kashmiri militants who have committed acts of terrorism in Indian-controlled Kashmir. Allegations have also been made that Pakistan lends support to Sikh militants engaged in terrorism in Indian Punjab.

A classification of being a terrorist state would have a devastating effect on Pakistan. Pakistan would be ineligible for any United States aid, including humanitarian aid, and Congress would be required to vote against any loans to Pakistan from multilateral lending agencies. In addition, under section 505 of the International Trade and Security Act of 1985, Pakistan would also be banned from importing goods and services to the United States as a nation supporting terrorism.

Pakistan has worked hand in hand with the United States in the quest for democracy. They were vital during the cold war in fighting the spread of communism. The CIA, in cooperation with Pakistan intelligence, trained Afghan guerrillas to combat Soviet aggression in Afghanistan.

Most of the complaints against Pakistan have come from India. Pakistan and India are involved in a longstanding and deeply rooted dispute regarding the State of Kashmir. Pakistan insists that it only lends diplomatic and moral support to separatist groups in Kashmir and Punjab and it denies backing Sikh militants.

Kashmir, the only majority Moslem state in India, was recognized by the United Nations as a disputed territory and Pakistan agrees to resolve this conflict based on the resolutions approved by the Security Council and United Nations Commission for India and Pakistan. In addition, Pakistan has offered to negotiate this issue bilaterally in accordance with the Simla agreement.

As a matter of fact, Pakistan has been deeply concerned about its being viewed a terrorist state. The Pakistan Government has deported Arab fundamentalists who have been connected to anti-Government terrorist activities in India, Algeria, and Egypt. They also offered full support to India in apprehending perpetrators involved in a series of bombings on Bombay. In addition, they replaced the director of Pakistan's interservices intelligence who was allegedly involved with supporting militants in Kashmir and Punjab.

Their actions have been in response to a statement released by the State Department on January 8, 1993, that Pakistan would be placed under active

continuing review because of alleged terrorist activities in Kashmir and Punjab. If placed on the terrorist list, Pakistan will have the same status of countries such as Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, and Syria. Countries that have perpetuated anti-American sentiment throughout the Moslem world, propaganda that Pakistan has consistently disregarded. In fact, Pakistan has supported the United States and provided a positive view of our Nation to their Moslem counterparts.

This is a disturbing classification for Pakistan considering their longstanding alliance with the United States and the fact that they were not named in the April 1993 U.S. State Department annual report to Congress, Patterns of Global Terrorism, 1992.

The State Department can place a country on the terrorist list at any time. But, placing Pakistan on this list when it didn't appear in the recent report to Congress would be a rash decision.

In layman's terms the Pakistan economy would be dealt a severe blow and Pakistan-American trade relations would simply deteriorate. There would be restrictions on movement of Embassy staff thereby delaying visa processing and other services. Limitations would be placed on United States-Pakistan flights. Pakistani citizens would no longer be able to attend United States colleges and universities and Pakistan-Americans would have problems traveling back to the country to visit relatives and friends.

Many disagree with the State Department on considering Pakistan as a terrorist state. Pakistan has not shown to be involved in anti-Western propaganda and terrorism like Iran or Libya. To classify it as such strains the good relations that have existed between our two countries for decades.

Pakistan is still contending with the problems brought on during that time. According to Molly Moore and John Anderson in an article in the April 21, 1993, Washington Post:

A nation that once was a linchpin of American foreign policy has become a casualty of post-cold war political realignments. Amid domestic political turmoil, Pakistan is struggling to cope with the refuse of a superpower battle: A glut of weapons in the marketplace, large numbers of restless, combat-experienced foreign guerrillas, millions of Afghan refugees, and an unbridled drug trade.

Also in the same article Pakistan's Secretary for Foreign Affairs Shahayar Khan said:

We fought the Afghan war for 14 years, and now people who were committed to our side are suddenly seen as villains and branded as terrorists.

In addition to their vital role in ending Soviet aggression in Afghanistan, they assisted in developing our relationship with China when they offered their diplomatic services to then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger who

flew to China from Pakistan in July 1976. This shows the ability of Pakistan to pave the way for United States relations with other countries who may have anti-American sentiments.

Pakistani troops served with our troops in Operation Desert Storm. They joined United States troops in assisting the United Nations in Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. Pakistan risked its own national security when it allowed the United States to use espionage aircraft to fly from its bases over the Soviet Union during the 1960's.

Pakistan has been instrumental in denuclearizing south Asia and plays a stabilizing role in central Asia and the Middle East. They have advocated the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in south Asia. Their proposal has been endorsed by the U.N. General Assembly. In 1979, Pakistan expressed its readiness to accede to Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty [NPT] simultaneously with India.

Pakistan is also essential to the United States for its stand in the Moslem world. Pakistan is the world's third largest moderate Moslem country and has consistently supported America serving as an example to other Moslem nations. With many Moslem countries perpetuating anti-American sentiments, Pakistan serves as our one and best opportunity to develop and change the relationship America has with Moslem nations.

The United States has made economic and intellectual investments in Pakistan that should be cultivated. We must continue to foster this relationship and not make hasty decisions that would hurt both American and Pakistani interests.

Declaring Pakistan a terrorist state would not only be a slap in the face but it would only further strain relations between Pakistan and India. Pakistan, after all its years of service to the United States, would be a virtual outcast. It would interrupt the stabilizing force that Pakistan has offered and would cause them to ally themselves closer to their nearest neighbor, Iran. The United States should be working diplomatically to resolve the differences between the two nations.

This issue must be thoroughly investigated and debated before the United States makes such a strong decision. Prof. Thomas P. Thornton of the Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University wrote an article in yesterday's Christian Science Monitor. I quote:

Pakistan is *** a large and very important country that plays a key role in the Moslem world—a place where we need friends. We need to get beyond the disillusion and embitterment that have characterized United States-Pakistan relations and find a middle ground where we can build a relationship that meets specific, limited mutual interest. Declaring Pakistan a terrorist state is not the way to start.

I agree with Professor Thornton and those Washington and Islamabad offi-

cials who feel this decision would be counterproductive and unfair. We must work with both India and Pakistan in seeking a fair solution. If Pakistan-India relations are to improve we must play the role of the impartial facilitator.

I urge the administration to remove Pakistan from active continuing review and to cease the threat of making Pakistan a terrorist state. I urge my congressional colleagues to contact the administration to voice their concern over the treatment of Pakistan. We cannot nor should we, lose a loyal and valuable ally. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

THE PRESIDENTIAL HAIRCUT AND TRAVEL OFFICE PROBE

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. HASTINGS]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times today has an interesting headline: "Haircut Costs Airlines \$76,000." Then underneath it, FBI Angry About Politicizing of Travel Office Probe."

Mr. Speaker, this was an administration that came to power on the claim of representing the middle class. Frankly, the claim of getting the economy going again, a middle-class tax cut, and doing something about the cost of health care to make it more affordable for people. Also, there has been a strong patina of concern about ethics.

I just think that it is very disturbing to see what is happening, in just the first few months of this administration.

Just to look at this Washington Times story for a minute, with reference to the haircut controversy, which in some ways is a tempest in a teapot, but in another is very symbolic of the great distance between this administration, and middle America.

The Citizens for a Sound Economy did some investigating to find out what the cost of that haircut was, above and beyond, of course, the \$200, plus whatever the tip may have been.

A CSE spokesman quoted, from the Washington Times:

CSE spokesman Jeff Nesbit told the Washington Times that costs provided by the airline industry indicate that Mr. Clinton's 56-minute haircut and the security block of two nearby runways in Los Angeles Monday cost the industry \$76,000.

Now, I guess that does not include time involved with Air Force One, if it had its engines running. Air Force One is a 747, an enormous airplane. So it certainly showed, at best, a tremendous political insensitivity, and it imposed a number of costs upon various parties, certainly the airlines and, indirectly, or I guess directly, the American public, paying for the cost of Air Force One.

Now I would like to talk a little bit about this other issue, because this, again, goes right to the issue of ethics and the issue of relating to the American public. "FBI Angry About White House Politicizing of Travel Office Probe." And again, quoting from the Washington Times today, and substantially the same story is in the Washington Post:

FBI agents charged that the White House "politicized" its operations by demanding a highly unusual statement confirming an investigation of the White House Travel Office. FBI sources said the agency had not been looking into mismanagement charges in the Travel Office after a White House audit was conducted, a direct contradiction of White House statements that the FBI was involved from the beginning.

□ 1910

Skiping down and quoting:

One high-ranking FBI source said: "The FBI cannot be identified as a friend or a foe of any administration. It has to be perceived as neutral in all cases. On its surface, this unusual announcement served no purpose other than to legitimize a political decision."

Mr. Speaker, on the issue now of the travel agency, it is very interesting to see what some of the details are about that. Quoting from an article that appeared in the Sacramento Bee on Sunday, May 23, by columnist Pete Dexter:

Mr. Stephanopolos did not say who was allowed to bid against Clinton's 25-year-old once- or twice-removed cousin Catherine Cornelius for the position of temporary head of the travel staff.

He did not say which agencies were allowed to bid against the Little Rock, Arkansas firm World Wide Travel that was at first named to handle the White House's travel plans. World Wide and its owner, Betta Carney, were large political supporters of Clinton and large contributors. They paid off some of his campaign debts, in fact, debts Clinton would have otherwise been responsible for himself. After a deluge of criticism, World Wide itself was quickly dropped late Friday.

Then, quoting from the Washington Times:

The White House also conceded yesterday that Penny Sample, president of Air Advantage—an airline company the Clinton campaign used last year—has volunteered to work in the travel office to solicit bids and choose winners for White House airplane charters, mainly for the jet that carries the press to presidential events outside of Washington.

Asked if Ms. Sample is "interested in this business for her own firm," Ms. Meyers said, "I would think."

Mr. Speaker, this controversy reveals a tremendous gap between the President, his administration, and the middle class of America. We elected Bill Clinton, we did not intend to elect Michael Dukakis or George McGovern, but it would seem that indeed we may have gotten more of the philosophy of the latter.

FULL DISCLOSURE FOR THE PUBLIC

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BACCHUS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a week ago every Member of this House disclosed details of our personal finances to public scrutiny. That is, we made such disclosure to the extent that it is required by current law.

The truth is, Federal law does not require all that much disclosure of Members of Congress. There are enough loopholes in the current law to drive a truck through, or maybe a Mercedes.

Mr. Speaker, on the forms that we file annually Members of Congress are only required to list assets and liabilities within broad categories of value, very broad categories. The ranges are so broad, in fact, that it is impossible to tell from a report whether a Member received a large increase in income from a particular source.

I make a different kind of financial disclosure. I call it full disclosure. I do so voluntarily, as do a handful of other Members of this House. Each year I file voluntarily copies of my income tax return and of my net worth statement listing all my assets and all my liabilities down to the last penny. I believe that every candidate for Congress and every Member of Congress should be required to do the same on an annual basis. I have done so since I first became a candidate.

I have a history, a long history, of working for full financial disclosure. In my State of Florida, full financial disclosure is enshrined in the State constitution. It is so because an enlightened leader named Reuben O'Donovan Askew, as Governor of that State, led a statewide initiative drive that amended the constitution to require full financial disclosure. I am proud that I helped him in that campaign in 1975 and 1976. I am proud that I am one of the coauthors of that sunshine amendment to the Florida constitution.

That is why I have joined with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], in a bipartisan effort to bring full financial disclosure to the Congress of the United States. We have introduced H.R. 1084, the Public Service Accountability Act of 1993. This would require full financial disclosure. It calls for the listing of exact amounts and sources of all assets and liabilities, just as I have done voluntarily, and just as the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has done, as well.

This would also require Members of the Congress and candidates for Congress to file an annual statement of net worth and copies of their tax returns from the previous year.

Why would we do this? Why would we take such extraordinary steps? These

are extraordinary times. I cannot imagine how much greater the cynicism or the skepticism of the people could be. We need to take extraordinary steps in these extraordinary times to reassure the people that we are really working for them and not for ourselves or some selfish special interest.

As far as I am concerned, the people have every right to know what we own, what we owe, and how much we owe. They have the right to know every detail of our personal finances. I have no expectation of privacy in my personal finances, nor does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], nor do the handful of Members who have cosponsored our resolution.

In my view, Mr. Jefferson was right long ago when he said that, "When one assumes a public office, he becomes a public property." We need to take the extraordinary step of passing H.R. 1084 and reassuring the people that a public office truly is a public trust.

TRAVELGATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I take 5 minutes today to describe what I think is a most outrageous injustice, an outrageous abuse of police power, and then an outrageous coverup by President Clinton and the White House over the last few days.

The gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE] outlined the situation with Travelgate, where employees were fired for what seems to be a replacement in organizing travel by the White House, being replaced by a distant cousin of the President and campaign contributors of the President, to be able to participate in the huge amounts of money that go into travel in the White House and by the press corps.

When the White House was called on firing these employees, they tried to claim that the firings were triggered May 12, solely because management irregularities were found. This is not true. The American people need to know it.

On February 15, Ms. Cornelius sent a memo to David Watkins proposing the dismissals and hiring of World Wide Travel by both the White House and the Democratic National Committee. Does that sound a little fishy? Moreover, the White House has insisted that the FBI was involved in investigating the travel office before an independent accounting firm was called in to audit the office. FBI officials said yesterday, however, that they were not involved in the investigation of alleged financial misconduct by the fired White House travel staff until the firings took place on Wednesday, after the White House audit was conducted.

Even more outrageous are today's reports that the White House has violated its own policy of noninterference with the Justice Department investigations. White House officials acknowledged taking the highly unusual step of summoning the Director of the FBI's Public Affairs Office last week and asking him to issue a news release saying criminal investigation of the seven workers was warranted, an absolute abuse of police power.

The Washington Post reports that at a meeting held at the White House, administration officials provided guidance in drafting an FBI release to back up its contention that possible criminal acts, not political cronyism, were the reason the travel staff had been fired abruptly.

□ 1920

When has the White House ever taken it upon itself to intervene in a Justice Department investigation, bypassing the Attorney General who has responsibility for the FBI, and tailored a press release to suit its own needs, and informed the Nation that an investigation of American citizens was ongoing? This is unbelievable and unprecedented.

Attorney General Janet Reno was never informed that the White House had asked the FBI to review the travel office matter, nor was she shown the FBI press release put out by the White House last Friday. Reno is reported to be outraged, as we are, and has called the White House counsel yesterday to protest the White House handling of the matter.

Now, to try to mend the damages, the White House has severed its partnership with World Wide Travel.

But now the White House is claiming that the seven travel office employees were not actually fired. Indeed, White House spokesman, George Stephanopoulos, said today that only the two employees with financial authority were considered fired, and that five were actually on administrative leave. The administrative leave would be extended indefinitely, meaning they could continue to be paid. That is an unbelievable coverup by White House trying to cover up an unsavory situation.

Chief of Staff Mack McLarty and Budget Director Leon Panetta have been directed to conduct a review of the entire matter. This is not enough. These people have been fired and their names have been dirtied by the White House by implying that there was criminal activities by them. How are they going to get a job in the future?

The House has to immediately call for hearings on this matter. Those who are responsible for this outrage should be fired, or at the very least we ought to have adult supervision in the White House.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS ACT OF 1993

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUSH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an important piece of legislation, the Community Development Financial Institutions Act of 1993, House Resolution No. 2250.

I do so with the belief that putting the economic needs of the people of inner city communities, rural areas, and close-in suburban areas on the same playing field is one of a series of steps necessary to make sure that equal economic opportunities are fully extended to all Americans. This bill is designed for those Americans who, as President Bill Clinton describes them, are "willing to work hard and play by the rules."

The bill I have introduced will create the National Community Development Administration [the NCDA]. The NCDA's mission will be the fostering of public-private partnerships which will provide access to credit and financial resources by low- and moderate-income people as well as small, minority- and women-owned businesses. These are the groups and individuals which have traditionally been denied access to adequate levels of capital and credit. Thousands of these groups are located within communities like Illinois' First Congressional District, which I represent.

Building from an initial appropriation of \$200 million for fiscal year 1994, specifically, this bill would provide assistance in the forms of grants, loans, and technical assistance to new and existing community development financial institutions.

Innovative groups and individuals across the country who know, first hand, what steps to take to improve their communities will now be able to obtain the economic resources to do so. It allows creative ventures to be undertaken including everything from supporting the efforts of local groups to demolish and remove abandoned buildings, to facilitating the development of low- and moderate-income housing, to helping groups with successful track records in building small projects to obtain extra capital and credit to do more of the same but on a broader scale, thereby impacting larger groups of people and families.

And, Mr. Speaker, the good news is the NCDA will accomplish these goals in a way that does not create one more Federal bureaucracy but, instead, builds on the insights gained from some of the hard-fought struggles, and mistakes, of the past.

The NCDA will encourage healthy competition among certified applicants to get the most bang for their limited bucks. It will require matching private

funds for the grants and loans it issues on at least a 1:1 basis. It will recycle funds back to lenders by encouraging secondary market activities among private actors, and it will promote the use of a new investment instrument that will bring dollars from individuals, corporations, and institutions into community development depository institutions for their long-term use.

With the added investment from individuals and institutional investors, millions of Americans will not only be able to take advantage of needed tax deferrals, but will also be playing a direct role in helping to capitalize an organization whose single mission is to systematically reinvest in and redevelop America's inner city and rural communities.

Finally, the real significance of this legislation is not just about credit or banking. It is about genuine, comprehensive, permanent community development. With this bill, I hope to give individuals the tools to determine their own destinies; to take their, and their families' futures into their own hands and work hard to achieve what, until now, has been in sight, but beyond their grasp—that elusive state of being called prosperity. I know that real prosperity cannot exist without the economic building blocks that so many of the hard working men and women in disinvested urban, suburban, and rural communities lack.

I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support this bill which is designed to foster increased access to good-paying jobs; increased entrepreneurship and self-sufficiency; higher living standards and quality of life, and the creation of other assets within local communities.

I believe the kind of development the NCDA will focus on will steadily increase the confidence of local residents, business owners, and workers in targeted communities as these groups begin to realize that their community's fortunes are on the rise. I also believe that outside investors will become increasingly convinced that communities that are coming alive again are the types of communities that merit their careful and considered support—and their investment dollars.

By reinvesting in people and organizations that live in, or care about, our cities and rural areas, I strongly believe that the Community Development Financial Institutions Act of 1993 will be a catalyst for real change in the lives of countless Americans in the years to come.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2244, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, TRANSFERS AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1993; AND WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST H.R. 2118, SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1993, AND AGAINST ITS CONSIDERATION

Mr. MOAKLEY, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 103-110) on the resolution (H. Res. 183) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2244) making supplemental appropriations, transfer, and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and waiving points of order against the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against its consideration, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

RECONCILIATION AND THE CLINTON TAX INCREASES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak again to the House tonight, as I did last night, and discuss facets of the forthcoming reconciliation bill which includes the largest tax increase in the history of the human race that will be placed on Americans in all walks of life. I have listened to Democrats who extol the virtues of this bill, and I would like to discuss a little bit about why some of their comments are, in my opinion, misplaced.

But before I do so, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS].

□ 1930

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

I would propose to address the subject that the gentleman has introduced from the perspective of a member of the Committee on Rules and share my very grave concerns that we are not going to be able to do full justice to this extraordinarily important issue in this House because of the Committee on Rules. In fact, tomorrow, the Committee on Rules will take up the Clinton tax bill, a massive tax hike on most Americans, and during that committee process, several Members, this gentleman included, will present alternatives to the energy tax, particularly, and the Social Security tax provisions that are in that bill.

The energy tax, the Btu tax, as we call it, is supposed to raise approximately \$70 billion over the next 5 years by taxing virtually every good and service produced or performed in the United States. That is something that every family is going to feel and, frankly, many families cannot afford it. Not only is this proposed tax inflationary because it is going to increase the cost of goods and services, it is going to fall hard on middle-income America. We have heard a lot about middle-income America during the campaign, the very people then-candidate Clinton said he would spare from new taxes.

As for the Social Security tax, it is certainly going to impact millions of seniors who have very modest incomes whose only fault is that they are trying to take some responsibility for their own retirement. They have been prudent, they have set aside, and now we are going to propose to tax them because they are a convenient target. Quite simply, these are not rich people.

I know many, because they live in my district. They are people who are struggling to make ends meet, people earning as little as \$25,000 a year. This tax is projected to raise \$32 billion over the next 5 years, raising the percentage of Social Security taxable from 50 percent to a whopping 85 percent.

Adding insult to injury, this tax changes the rules of Social Security which is supposed to be a self-financing trust fund, as we know. This new tax plan will generate revenues from Social Security recipients that will go directly to the General Treasury, and that scares people who are on Social Security, and it should.

Mr. ARCHER. I was on the President's Commission on Social Security Reform in 1982, and that Commission recommended to the Congress and had adopted by the Congress, and I might say that I opposed this provision, but nevertheless, this is the way it occurred, for the first time that 50 percent of the Social Security benefits be taxed, and in doing so, they justified that on the basis that 50 percent of the money going into the payment of FICA taxes was tax-deductible to the employee but 50 percent was after-tax dollars on the part of the employee, and they further specified that inasmuch as this was in effect reducing benefits for those people who had enough income to be above the threshold, the threshold by the way which was not indexed for inflation, and as a result, here we are 10 years later, and that is the same threshold but in real dollars, of course, it is much, much lower and picks up people who actually have a lower income.

But they put that tax that was generated by taxing 50 percent of the benefits back into the Social Security trust fund, which is where it should have been placed.

Now the gentleman has appropriately explained to the people of this country that in Clinton's new tax on Social Security beneficiaries, that almost doubles it, that money will no longer go back into the trust fund for the benefit of the elderly in future generations of this country but will be deposited in the General Treasury to pay for President Clinton's new spending programs.

Is that correct?

Mr. GOSS. If the gentleman will yield further, that is precisely what is so scary about this.

I know the distinguished gentleman's participation and understanding, and not only do we have pain here, we have a breach of faith if not contract.

Why are we doing all this? The Clinton administration is telling us we are raising taxes to reduce the national debt, but read the small print and you will see that 5 years down the road after Americans have paid all of these new taxes we are talking about, our national debt is going to be bigger, \$1 trillion bigger at least, not smaller, and in fact, the annual deficit will be climbing, according to the budget resolution we have passed. So what happens is we get to a defining moment, and I would suggest that the gentleman's hour this evening is a defining moment here.

We have got debate on a tax plan right now, and we are focusing on taxes, when we should be focusing on cutting spending. We know that Americans know that.

We are setting a course for our national economic security for years to come, and we are not going to be doing it in a broad spectrum of the full will of this body, because my view is that the Committee on Rules is not going to allow that to happen. I hope I am wrong, but as we meet tomorrow, we will know.

Americans are demanding that we cut spending. That is the message that is coming in on my phone and through my mailbag, and I think for the first time in years there is a real momentum among people to bring down the Federal deficit by bringing down the size and scope and the waste in Government.

I am not quite sure why we are being asked to resort to punitive and inflationary tax increases at a time when so much waste and low-priority spending is continuing to bloat our Federal budget.

If you ask the question abroad in this country, has the Federal Government removed all waste from its budget, there is not a place across this country that you would not get a horselaugh if somebody answered "yes." So I suggest our tax problem is not our tax problem, it is our wasteful-spending problem.

If we were focused a little bit more on that, I think we would have a little bit more credibility with the people of this country. I think it is wrong to tell

Americans that higher taxes are a given when we have not really begun to cut spending.

Tomorrow I and I know others are going to present the Committee on Rules with alternative plans. I am putting forward one that wipes out the energy and Social Security taxes in the bill and replaces them with \$104 billion in spending cuts. It is a serious proposal. I have worked very hard on it.

If Members do not like my list of spending cuts, I hope they will come up with their own list, because there is certainly plenty to choose from. There is no doubt that that is the point that the people of this country are trying to convey to us, and we seem to be slow in getting the message.

I greatly thank the gentleman from Texas, the distinguished ranking member, for allowing me the opportunity to convey that message to the people tonight.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the contribution of the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to address that part of the reconciliation package that incorporates the President's vaccine proposal, and to encourage my colleagues to support a rule which would make the Camp/Klug/Greenwood, et al. amendment in order when the budget reconciliation proposal is debated by this House.

Like many of my colleagues, I am deeply concerned about the health of America's children and the sad state of immunization rates in this country. I am committed to making sure all children are vaccinated and that vaccinations are available to children whose parents cannot afford them. I do not, however, think that it is the Federal Government's role or responsibility to provide free vaccines to Donald Trump's children or to my daughters Katie and Laura.

Given the fiscal constraints facing the Federal Government, it does not make sense to establish a new entitlement program for well-off Americans. I believe the amendment I have developed with Mr. CAMP, Mr. KLUG, and others represents a much more responsible approach.

Perhaps I bring a special perspective to this issue. Prior to being elected to public office I served as a children and youth social worker. I am proud to have been considered an advocate for children throughout my tenure in the Pennsylvania legislature. I also was honored to serve on Governor Casey's commission for children and families. The commission spent a great deal of time looking at what works and what does not work when trying to ensure that children are immunized and that they are immunized at the appropriate age.

Through my experience I have seen firsthand what works for families that

are impoverished and those with less than perfect parents. In developing our amendment, we incorporated what has been proven to work—and that is requiring parents to get their children immunized if they are to participate in State and Federally funded programs and school.

We have seen it work in Maryland, for example, where waivers provide AFDC sanctions and special needs allowances for recipients to encourage them to meet education and preventive health care requirements established by the State. We have seen it in every State where immunizations are required before children start school and as a result immunization rates reach 98 percent.

Our amendment simply proposes that States be granted the option to increase AFDC and food stamp benefits if parents comply with the immunization requirement or decrease the benefits if parents do not comply. States may use either or both of these financial inducements. The amendment also would provide \$100 million per year for the purchase and delivery of vaccines for the approximately 400,000 uninsured children under age 5.

I proposed this kind of approach during the joint House/Senate hearing on the President's legislation which was attended by HHS Secretary Shalala. At the hearing Secretary Shalala indicated, " * * * we have experimented, using the WIC program, for example, using the Head Start Programs, to try to get more children in, and some of these economic incentives and other kinds of incentives have worked—I think we ought to do all of the above. I am not opposed, nor is the Clinton administration, to trying every kind of positive incentive of education program." When I queried the Secretary on whether she would support including such a requirement as a criterion for entry into certain programs, she replied "Yes, absolutely, absolutely."

Furthermore, during a recent visit to Cleveland, President Clinton said that he thought such an approach was "a good idea."

This is not a partisan issue. We need to encourage parents to take responsibility to ensure the health and safety of their children. I believe our amendment is a more responsible and less costly approach toward that goal. I would urge my colleagues to support it.

□ 1940

Mr. ARCHER. Would the gentleman tell this body what the total cost of his amendment would be as compared to what the cost of the Clinton proposal is, which was adopted in the committee?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Our proposal saves, over the course of 5 years, I believe the number is, \$980 million, or nearly \$1 billion in savings.

The extraordinary thing is that we save all of that money and, instead of

raising the rate of immunization a mere 5 percent as we would expect from the President's proposal, we would raise the rate probably close to the 98 percent that we see at the age of 5 years old.

So, what we are seeing is many, many more children needing desperately the help of their Government to help the parents do what the parents should do: more children immunized; far, far less cost.

Mr. ARCHER. I compliment the gentleman on his approach.

The gentleman highlights what is present in many, many other categories; the extreme increase in spending on the part of the Clinton administration without the productive results; and that there are ways to accomplish these solutions to problems without opening the floodgates of the Federal treasury and, once again, having to go to the American taxpayers and say, "Pay some more to Washington." I think it is an excellent suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, a respected member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. BUNNING. I thank the gentleman, the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, my wife, Mary, has always been a big believer in the old saying—"If you can't say something nice about somebody, don't say anything at all."

She tries to get me to follow that advice. Sometimes, I manage to follow it. Sometimes, I do not do so well.

But Mr. Speaker, if I were following my wife's advice today and if the President of the United States was standing right here on the floor of this House and if he asked me what I thought of this tax bill, I would have to look the President of the United States in the eye and say to him, "Mr. President, that's a mighty nice haircut you got there."

Mr. Speaker, I would rather compliment someone for his \$200 haircut than I would say anything nice about the President's tax bill.

In fact, I cannot find anything nice to say about a tax bill that raises taxes \$322.4 billion in new taxes. It is just downright crazy.

Tax increases just do not reduce the deficit. Congress has proven that over and over again. Every time this body raises taxes, it just turns around and raises spending.

And I have never seen a single economic model which even begins to suggest that you can create prosperity with tax increases. It just cannot be done.

How soon we forget? You do not have to look any further back than 1990. The tax increase did not reduce the deficit. But it did help throw us into recession.

You just cannot ax your way to prosperity and you cannot tax your way to

a balanced budget. It just will not work.

So, no, I do not like the President's tax package and I cannot think of anything nice to say about it.

The energy tax is bad policy—it is counterproductive policy. The waterway user fee is terrible. The Ways and Means Committee did cut this outrageous tax increase in half but that does not make it all that much better. It still is ridiculous.

But the one tax proposal in the President's proposal that stands out above all the others when it comes to unfairness and dishonesty, is the President's proposal to raise from 50 to 85 percent the portion of Social Security benefits that is taxable.

We are not talking about wealthy people here. We are talking about individuals with incomes over \$25,000—couples over \$32,000.

We are talking about people who managed to scrimp and save and put enough money away for his or her retirement years to have a modest income. It is a retirement planning penalty.

Some people have criticized the President's tax plan because it breaks his promise not to raise taxes on middle-class America. Generally they point to the energy tax—the Btu tax—as the culprit, because that tax is passed on to every consumer and every homeowner in the country. This is the trickle-down tax.

But the proposal to raise taxes on Social Security benefits is the real broken promise.

The administration fudged their numbers enough to be able to say that 70 percent of the increased tax burden would fall on people with incomes over \$100,000. This is just not true.

But 70 percent of the increased revenue from the Social Security tax increase falls on people with incomes well under \$100,000—generally seniors with incomes between \$25,000–\$50,000.

The President's tax plans singled out millionaires—people with incomes over \$250,000—for that special 10 percent tax surcharge. But the Social Security tax increase does exactly the same for many people with incomes between \$30,000 and \$50,000. Many of these middle-class, retired folks will be hit with tax increases over 10 percent.

They are not millionaires. They are not even wealthy by most standards. But many Social Security recipients will be hit with 10, 11, 12, even 13 percent increases in their overall tax liability because of this proposal.

That is a crime. But it gets worse.

As Mr. GOSS and Mr. ARCHER have mentioned, over and above the outrageous inequity of this kind of tax increase for the elderly, there is another big problem with the Social Security tax increase.

Not only does it penalize savings and investment, it also breaks a sacred promise to Social Security recipients.

When the tax on Social Security benefits was enacted in 1983, the revenues were directed to the Social Security trust fund to insure its future solvency. That was the purpose of the tax—to keep the Social Security trust fund strong.

The administration's proposal does not do that. The President's proposal originally diverted the additional revenues to Medicare. We are talking about an outright raid on the Social Security trust fund. But Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee took it one further step and directed the new money straight into the General Treasury.

That makes the proposal to increase taxes on Social Security benefits an outrageous breach of faith to Social Security and senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, the Social Security tax increase is not only bad policy, it is a broken promise and breach of faith.

I ask my colleagues to remember, that just 2 months ago, each and every one of you—who was here that day—voted for a motion to instruct House conferees to delete the Social Security tax increase.

The conferees did not do it. The Social Security tax increase is still here—in the reconciliation bill. You cannot hide behind that vote from March 25 any more.

If you vote for this reconciliation bill, you are voting for the largest tax increase in history and for an outrageous tax on senior citizens.

Mr. ARCHER. On the waterway user tax, what emerged and was clear in the bill is still a 250-percent tax increase, is it not?

Mr. BUNNING. It is. In other words, from 19 cents, a proposal of \$1.19, we now have in the bill 69 cents.

Mr. ARCHER. Is it not also true that studies have shown that the use of barges on the water is the most efficient, and the least injurious to the environment, of any mode of transportation?

Mr. BUNNING. It also shows that very clearly.

Mr. ARCHER. And will this not have a major negative impact on the ability of that source of transportation to do its job in competition with other alternatives?

Mr. BUNNING. I can quote you chapter and verse from some of my very good friends who are in that business and who are going to be suffering. Instead of putting them out of business, as one of the members on our Ways and Means Committee said, in 5 years, it will now take 2 years under this proposal.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman for making that point because it is very, very important to all of the people of this country.

□ 1950

Mr. ARCHER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, why does the gentleman

suppose that President Clinton and his Democrat majority in the House has decided to target senior citizen for this very punitive tax, particularly considering that the ones they target are the ones who sacrificed during their work lives in order to save for their own retirement so they would not be wards of government, or possibly have to continue to work in order to make ends meet?

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas will yield, I do not know the answer, but the fact of the matter is, if there would have been something in this bill to allow a senior to earn more and remove the earnings limit also, I could understand a little better what they are proposing; but the fact of the matter is the penalty on the senior citizens and the breach of trust of the trust fund is something I am not able to comprehend.

Mr. ARCHER. Well, I share the gentleman's inability to comprehend it, because whether you are a union worker who forewent wages during the worklife in order to get a pension for him and then finds that because they get a pension benefit in their retirement years suddenly they are considered to be rich and their Social Security taxes are going to find that 85 percent of them are taxed by the Clinton Democrat program, they have got to wonder, "Why didn't I take my wages up front instead of foregoing them in exchange for a retirement program?"

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, even the Federal employee is going to be doubly penalized under this proposal, for the simple reason of the offset in the Federal retirement in direct relationship to the Social Security benefit; so we are not talking about people just on private pensions, we are talking about people on public pensions who are going to be penalized even more under this proposal.

Mr. ARCHER. Would the gentleman agree that most economists say that the biggest problem in the United States today is a lack of savings?

Mr. BUNNING. That is pretty much the case.

Mr. ARCHER. Would the gentleman further agree that this provision sends just the reverse signal to the American worker that they should not save, because if they save during their work lives they are going to be faced with the highest marginal tax of their entire lives once their Social Security benefits start being taken?

Mr. BUNNING. That is absolutely true.

Mr. ARCHER. That is precisely the wrong signal, in my opinion, to send to American workers.

I greatly thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER].

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

The eyes of America are on this House as they rightly should be this week as we struggle with the issue of whether to vote for the largest tax increase in this Nation's history, but the eyes of the Members of this House should in turn be on my State of New Jersey, because we have gone through a very similar experience. In fact, if the States are indeed the laboratories of democracy, then New Jersey is one laboratory that blew up because of an experiment that was endeavored to be performed by our Governor, former Congressman Jim Florio. This is an experiment which unfortunately Bill Clinton wants to replicate.

It was 3 years ago that Jim Florio took office after a campaign in which he said that we did not need to raise taxes, and in a very eerie situation of *deja vu* all over again, we can recall, those of us from New Jersey, that he took office and he said he was shocked to find that the deficit was far larger than he had anticipated it was, and it was all the fault of his Republican predecessor.

So in short order, he proposed a massive tax increase, the greatest tax increase in the history of our State, and he told the middle class whose taxes were going to be increased that they should feel good about it because the rich were going to pay even more.

It was railroaded through the Democratic State legislature, signed into law, and when that happened Jim Florio promised us that this massive tax increase was going to pave the way to prosperity for the State of New Jersey.

He promised us that New Jersey would lead the region and the Nation out of the recession, that we would no longer have annual budget crises, that we would no longer have to fix holes in our budget with one-shot gimmicks, that we would be a model for the rest of the Nation.

It is 3 years later now and that experiment has had an opportunity to play out.

And what has happened? New Jersey which in the 1980's had an unemployment rate that was 2 percent below the national average, with quite some consistency, now has the highest unemployment rate in the Nation amongst all industrialized States, 9.1 percent, 2 points above the national average, way above all our neighbors.

We are a basket case. The economists in the State of New Jersey are saying that there is no way out and they can see no light at the end of the tunnel.

We are leading the Nation in foreclosures. We have 1 family out of 110 declaring bankruptcy. Businesses are trying to escape the State of New Jersey, and the \$2.8 billion tax increase which was the record-breaking tax increase that Jim Florio gained through

legislation never yielded \$2.8 billion, because the economy went in the tank. Jobs were lost, income was reduced, profits were lower, and so as a result the budget still was a mess and we have not been able to balance it without gimmicks and without one-shot expedients ever since.

□ 2000

That, I think, is very instructive for us here at the national level. It should teach us that we cannot tax our way to prosperity. It should teach us that the only way to achieve real stability, and real prosperity and real budget responsibility is cutting the spending, and in fact that is what a Republican legislature, which was overwhelmingly elected after the Florio taxes went through, forced the Governor to accept: major spending cuts.

But that should be the first alternative, and that, of course, is what all our constituents are telling us. They are telling us, "Cut first. Don't even talk to us about tax increases until you cut the spending."

It is ironic that yesterday Gov. Jim Florio was awarded the Profiles in Courage Award by members of the Kennedy family for, among other things, increasing taxes on the people of New Jersey. One reason it is ironic is because it was J.F.K. who advocated lower taxes. It was J.F.K. who said, "A rising tide lifts all boats." And it was J.F.K.'s tax cuts that gave us the prosperity of the 1960's. I think the real Profiles in Courage Award should go to those representatives at the State and Federal level who have the courage to cut spending rather than to take the easier route and increase taxes.

I yield back.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] for his contribution, and he has graphically portrayed a microcosmic example of what is involved in the Clinton Democrat budget of extremely high increases in taxes with virtually little or no spending reductions, particularly in the first 2 years, and I am sure the gentleman is aware that in the first 2 years of the Clinton Democrat budget proposal that will be represented in reconciliation on the floor, expected this week. It includes zero net spending reductions in the first 2 years. Now, there are some minor cuts in spending in a few categories, but the increased spending for new projects and new programs offsets the minor cuts that are part of the budget. So, the result is that there are zero zero net spending reductions in the first 2 years, whereas the taxes, the massive tax increases, are effective immediately, and in some cases retroactively to the first of January this year.

So, it is a parallel to exactly what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] has laid out before this body that occurred in New Jersey, and clear-

ly, if we are going to work our way out of this fiscal mess, we must have a dynamic economy with workers improving their standard of living, generating a greater gross national product, and higher and higher taxes clearly are negative to that.

Mr. ZIMMER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I think that New Jersey is a case study in that. It is exhibit No. 1. It is a shame that millions of New Jerseyans have had to suffer economically to teach the Nation this lesson while other States which face similar crisis resisted the temptation to increase taxes. They cut spending, and they are having unemployment rates lower than the national average. They are coming out of this recession, States like Massachusetts under Governor Weld, Michigan under Governor Engler and so on—Wisconsin under Governor Thompson. These are States that did not succumb to the temptation of increased taxes, but rather to live within their means and to allow the private sector to bring prosperity and more revenues to those governments.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER], and I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING].

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], and I want to congratulate him for holding this special order tonight on the eve of what may be a most momentous vote in this House in the next 2 days on the largest tax increase in the history of America. Certainly the viewers of this proceeding have every right to know what is happening in their House, this House here, and I would like to talk about all of it which the gentlemen have so eloquently gone into. I would just like to comment a little bit about what the tax increase means to the agricultural economy of America.

Mr. Speaker, there are several things in this reconciliation bill that should make American agriculture stand up and maybe shiver with fear. First of all, as we came out of the Agriculture Committee on a very partisan vote with the reconciliation bill, we are going to cut over \$3 billion from production agriculture. Those are the programs that are meant to keep America competitive, to allow the American farmer to put reasonable food on the table of Americans and yet be competitive in the world market. But we are going to cut \$3 billion out of that. That is an 11 percent cut in the budget, and that is on top of 4 years of cuts in the neighborhood of 10 percent each year. So, this could very well cripple our farm program.

But in addition to that, Mr. Speaker, then, of course, we are going to raise spending \$7 billion for the food stamp program, which to most of Americans will make it look like the agricultural

segment is getting \$4 billion in new money.

But included along with all of this are the tax effects on the agricultural industry of America. It is truly the finest agricultural industry in the world. We could put them in dire straits with the Btu tax, and we should not be fooled because they took half of the Btu tax off. It is still a terrible tax on an industry that everything they use incorporates energy into the product that they make, whether it is livestock, whether it is corn, soybeans, tobacco, cotton. It does not matter, Mr. Speaker, and this tax will cost the average farmer, even with the reduction, hundreds of dollars for each average farmer.

And then we add to it the waterway tax which is particularly heavy on the mid-States: Illinois, Iowa, the States that depend on the waterway and the Mississippi river, and this will cost us 3 to 6 cents a bushel for every bushel of grain that we want to ship. It is a tremendous burden, another \$800 out of the pockets of the average farmer.

When we take the cuts in their programs, Mr. Speaker, the new taxes, we have a brewing disaster in rural America, and I predict we will be back here trying to resolve it with Federal dollars within the next 2 years, and all of that when we could turn loose the great engine of this country that drives our economy and let the private sector do it.

Of the \$70 billion the administration hopes to raise from the Btu tax, Mr. Speaker, we are going to give 40 back, or somewhere in that neighborhood, to new programs to justify the raising of the \$70 to \$80 billion in the Btu tax. We would not even have to have all the Btu tax if we were not going to have these programs to make lower income Americans hold themselves harmless from this tax—

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman allow me to comment on that?

Mr. EWING. Certainly.

Mr. ARCHER. It was interesting to me that last night one of the Members said it was going to be the tax and the higher rates on the rich that was going to pay for these extra welfare benefits, but in reality the extra spending that the gentleman talked about was put in the bill to soften the very negative impact, regressive impact, of the energy tax on these lower income people. So, the gentleman is absolutely correct that a tax that will generate in gross roughly \$100 billion of new revenue for the Federal Treasury after all of the deductions and paybacks will only impact on the deficit to the amount of \$31 billion.

Mr. EWING. It is incredible. We are going to make lower income people out of American farmers, and while they will be paying the tax, there will be no reimbursement to them through these

programs. They are going to pay—middle-class America, farmers, laborers—all of us are going to pay this Btu tax, and we are going to take out of our economy \$70 billion or more and let the Government spend it.

□ 2010

I think it will have devastating effect on Illinois. Probably thousands of jobs will be lost. In fact, there are predictions that in my district alone we will lose 1,000 jobs because of the Btu tax.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one other point. There was a tradeoff on the Btu tax. We have had ethanol. We have been trying to promote ethanol for a number of years. It makes good sense. It is renewable fuel made from a renewable source by American workers in this country. They are able to do that because of the tax exemption they had.

The exemption has been in and out, whether ethanol would be covered by the Btu tax. It was in, it was out, and it is back in. It can kill this industry. In addition, it will stifle the growth of the sale of corn in America for this very use, a way that we can take our corn and make it into gasoline additives and put it into our cars. It is crazy that we should be doing that. I know that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] knows that. I know the gentleman fought against it.

Because it is back on ethanol, then we are going to take half of the Btu tax off of diesel fuel. I understand we may have to color it purple so that we can tell that which should be taxed from that which should not be taxed for American farmers. That ought to be an interesting enforcement problem for this administration.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman makes an excellent point, and particularly concerning the energy tax on fuel. It is going to open up the door to massive evasion, tax evasion, because home heating oil, which gets an exemption from the punitive oil tax but not from the basic tax, and those people who buy home heating oil should understand that for the first time there is going to be a Federal tax on what they use to heat their homes, but it just will not be as big as the tax on diesel fuel.

Yet, home heating oil has the same chemical properties as diesel fuel, and you can be sure that a lot of home heating oil will be driving trucks on the highways of this country before all is said and done.

Mr. Speaker, I would thank the gentleman for his points, which were extremely well taken. In addition, I would add for the farmers of this country, every single product that they buy that has been manufactured in the United States of America will increase in cost because of what our colleague from Kentucky, Mr. BUNNING, called

the trickle-down energy tax, whether it is in the clothes they buy with synthetic fabric to put on their backs, or whether it is the fertilizer that they buy that is made from energy, or whether it is any aspect of their lives. The equipment they buy that is made from steel, which requires tremendous consumption of energy, they are going to see their costs increase tremendously.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, one thing I discovered recently in studying this legislation, which may have already been said here, that just incensed me is the fact that we have indexed it to inflation. So every year we can increase the tax on Americans silently, steal it in the middle of the night and bring it back to Washington. We ought to be ashamed of that type of action in this body.

Mr. ARCHER. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KLUG].

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]. As you know, the gentleman made the point a few minutes ago that the President's budget actually in the first 2 years increases spending. A number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are still intrigued with the possibility of trying to offer an alternative to the President's budget which would strip out the Btu tax and instead substitute it with cuts.

If I could for the next few minutes, I would like to point out a proposal drafted by a number of my Republican colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Education and Labor, and the Committee on Energy and Commerce, on which I sit, which will explain one of the reasons that the President's budget actually increases spending in a number of areas.

While frankly, in this area, it is another substitute we would like to see offered and approved by the Committee on Rules so we would have an opportunity to reduce spending, this is again a perfect illustration why the President's budget increases spending on some programs and not necessarily intelligently so.

My Democratic colleagues in the House right now are talking about trying to figure out a way to put caps on entitlement programs. As anybody who has taken a look at the Federal deficit understands, nearly 50 cents of every dollar we spend here in Washington goes to entitlement programs. Those are programs which rise every year by the cost of living, whether those of us who are in Congress do anything whatsoever.

Now, the President and his administration suggested several weeks ago we

were about to announce a \$4 billion entitlement program for childhood immunization. I, like a number of my colleagues in the House, and I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] is one of them, am deeply concerned about pockets in this country where the immunization rate is actually much lower than Third World countries. I think we are all horrified by that.

But if we are going to be spending money on a new program to solve the childhood immunization program, I would suspect a \$4 billion entitlement program is not the way to do that.

Initially, the administration, incredibly, wanted to nationalize the vaccination business in the United States, to take it completely over. The Federal Government would buy every single dose of vaccination, of immunization sold in the United States.

Now, does it really make sense when we have a \$3 trillion deficit to have the Federal Government buy the vaccination to treat Donald Trump's kids or Ross Perot's grandchildren? Where is the sense in that?

So the administration came back several weeks ago and cut it from \$4 billion to \$2 billion. But again let me take a minute to explain some of what happens.

First of all, every year right now the Federal Government covers about 6.5 million children under the Medicaid Program. Right now the Federal Government picks up 55 percent of the cost of the vaccinations and the State governments pick up 45 percent of the cost. That is the way it has been for years and the way we think it should continue.

But under the President's current proposal, the Federal Government will now pick up 100 percent of the cost of immunizing children under Medicaid in the United States.

Now, as I am sure my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], appreciates the fact, most State budgets in the United States are in the black and the Federal Government's budget is in the red. So why in God's name are we about to basically double the outlay of the Federal Government to buy vaccinations for kids covered under the Medicaid Program? That is not part of the problem.

In addition, the administration's proposal is going to cover another 4 million children plus whose families have insurance but who do not have childhood immunization covered under the package.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that that decision will basically provide coverage to 4 million children whose families make more than \$29,000 a year. Again, it could be Donald Trump's kids and he could have the best health insurance plan in the country, but it simply does not cover immunizations. We are then going to have

the Federal Government pay the cost, and that is another \$800 million a year.

Why are we spending \$800 million a year to vaccinate children of folks who make more than \$30,000 a year? If you take a look, interestingly, at a number of health care plans offered for Members of Congress, you will discover that many of us under our current health care plans do not have immunization coverage. So for Members of Congress, who make more than \$130,000 a year, the Federal Government is going to turn around and buy our children immunization programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is where we really should be spending money, which is on the last line here, which is 400,000 more kids under the age of 5 whose families make less than \$30,000 a year and who have no health insurance. That is money spent wisely, and that is what the Republican alternative will do.

Mr. Speaker, let me make another point. If you look at who does not have immunization in this country and what kids have not been vaccinated, it is clear that there is a high correlation between poverty, families on public assistance, and children who have not received immunizations.

In my home State of Wisconsin, in Milwaukee, several years ago, there was a horrendous outbreak of measles. So the assumption has been that somehow the cost of vaccination prevented those kids from getting the treatment they should.

But look at this. In Milwaukee nearly 90 percent of the children who are eligible for Medicaid coverage, where vaccinations are already provided free, had not gotten vaccinated. And look at these percentages for Los Angeles, 70 percent, and for Chicago, above 60 percent, and for Dallas, in the home State of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the figure is about 40 percent.

□ 2020

Now, there are 11 States in this country which already provide vaccinations free to everybody who asks for them. No questions asked. And the public vaccination rate in those areas, where the public vaccination rates in those areas are at about 62 or 63 percent. And in States like my home State of Wisconsin, where there is a mix of public and private, and the Federal Government picks up the tab for families who cannot afford it and for families who can, including Members of Congress, we pay our own bills, and in those States, we discover that the vaccination rate is about 58 percent.

So if there is a cost problem in this country, it may be for 5 percent, maybe 10 percent of the population who are marginally pushed out of programs. But there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest that cost alone is the major barrier.

The major barrier, as I am sure the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER]

understands, is the fact that we have a number of families who simply will not take responsibility for their own children.

So here is what the Republican alternative will do. Rather than spending \$2 billion, we spend about \$200 million, save the taxpayers \$1.8 billion that does not have to be spent on families who make more than \$30,000 a year.

First of all, it obviously reduces the unnecessary Federal funding. Under the Medicaid Program, we are again, rather than paying half the cost for immunization of children in Medicaid, we are now going to pick up the whole tab. And rather than providing another \$800 million in Federal funding for families who make more than \$30,000 a year, we are going to push it specifically at kids who are not being vaccinated.

We are going to spend, under the Republican plan, an extra \$50 million a year to give the States for community outreach and community education. We are going to spend another \$75 million a year giving States the opportunity to track children, to make sure that kids get an immunization shot once and complete the cycle, because oftentimes between the age of zero and 5, when they finally head to kindergarten, where about 95 percent of the kids are immunized, kids drop out of the program, and they get one DPT shot or one measles shot and then completely disappear.

So we are going to make \$50 million available for States to do outreach programs, another \$75 million a year to give States the money to track kids.

And then finally, here is the important point, we are going to turn around and give States across this country the opportunity to leverage public assistance programs, to make sure that the parents, who right now are not getting their kids immunized, will get them immunized. This is already being tried in a number of places across this country.

For example, in the State of South Carolina, there is now a law on the books that says no child can get into any kind of day-care setting unless they have been immunized. There is a law in Maryland, for example, that says any family that gets their kids covered under Medicaid and gets their child an annual checkup gets a \$20 bonus for each child. And if they do not get their child immunized, their AFDC payments get cut.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] will appreciate that fact, because there is some hard empirical evidence that for the 5 months leading up to the Maryland program, where it simply laid out the responsibility and the obligation to get kids vaccinated, there was no increase whatsoever in the level of children who were being vaccinated in the program. And then Maryland put the provision in the law which also had parental responsibility and parental

penalties. And in the first 3 months after that law was enacted, an additional 3,500 children showed up at Maryland vaccination clinics. And State officials were absolutely dumbfounded.

So the Republican initiative says to those States, you have got a waiver to try any kind of program you want, whether it is the Maryland program, which says there is a bonus if you get your kids immunized and penalties if you don't, whether it is the South Carolina program, which bans kids from getting into preschool programs and into day-care programs unless they have been immunized, whether it is the Georgia program, which already specifically indicates that if families do not get their kids immunized, then their AFDC payments will be cut back.

Now, some of my colleagues will say that is being tough on poor families, but certainly the indications are, in a number of welfare reform proposals that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SANTORUM] has been involved with, a colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] on the Committee on Ways and Means, the indications are clear that money alone is not a barrier to get children immunized.

Parental responsibility has to play a key role. So in the day ahead, for those Americans having an opportunity to watch this program tonight, there are several key points. Are we going to rush forward with a Btu tax that my colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] have made a very passionate case against, because it is simply bad economics. You cannot tax your way to prosperity. Washington has never had a revenue problem; Washington has always had a spending problem.

And if, as we heard Republican and Democratic speakers say throughout last year's Presidential Conventions, and throughout the conventions themselves, even Barbara Jordan, a colleague of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], a black woman, very prominent Democrat, talked about cutting back entitlement programs.

My colleagues, again on the Democratic side here, and I applaud the gentleman from Texas, Congressman STENHOLM, and others who are willing to say we will never get a handle on Federal spending unless we cap entitlement programs. And here we find, tucked in the Clinton budget, a \$2 billion program that will create new entitlement spending, that will increase every year and again provide vaccinations and immunizations to families who make \$30,000 a year, to Members of Congress, if their health insurance does not cover it at \$130,000 a year, and again to Ross Perot's grandchildren or Donald Trump's kids.

We cannot do it. We are broke. And if we are going to spend money, consider the Republican alternative, which spends \$225 million in the pockets of immunization shortages that the Centers for Disease Control has already identified and does not spend money in Sausalito and in the rich suburbs of Chicago or the boroughs of Manhattan, where we do not need to spend any more Federal money.

I applaud my colleague for all the work he has done on the Committee on Ways and Means to show the shortfall of the Btu tax.

It is my sincere hope that my Democratic colleagues will be allowed to offer their amendments in the Committee on Rules, and I also hope that in the end the Committee on Rules will allow us to offer the Republican alternative to spend \$200 million to take care of the kids who need the help and save another \$1.8 billion that does not need to be spent.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his graphic presentation, which I am sure the American people will understand that we do not need broad, new entitlement programs to solve problems.

Mr. KLUG. Absolutely not.

Mr. ARCHER. That is the important point that we are trying to make.

We also do not need massive new tax increases. We need to restrain the appetite of the Federal Government for spending. I am sure the gentleman will join with me in urging the Committee on Rules to make in order the Kasich budget alternative, a complete alternative for this high tax budget of the Clinton Democrats that will get the deficit down by the same amount without any tax increases.

I rather suspect that when we go before the Committee on Rules later this week, controlled by a big majority of Democrats, that they will accommodate their leadership's directions and prohibit even a vote on that.

It has specific spending cuts in it that the President has asked for. It has already been voted on once this year and defeated by a straight party line vote. I would, once again, ask our Democrat colleagues to go to the President and tell him, the Republicans are not nay sayers. They have an alternative. We have already voted down those specific spending cuts.

They should tell him, "Mr. President, take a look again."

So let us wait and see what the Committee on Rules does in making in order your amendment to prevent and obviate the need for another massive entitlements program and the overall Kasich budget, which would eliminate the need for any new taxes.

Mr. KLUG. I thank the gentleman. I think he makes an excellent point.

My colleague from Texas is absolutely right in this area. Again, the problem in Washington has always

been a problem of expense, never a problem of revenue. And there is no evidence whatsoever that the Btu tax is going to help the economy one bit.

And there is not any evidence, again, based on what the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. ZIMMER] had to say, that it is going to do much to solve the budget deficit.

Tax increases did not solve the budget deficit in New Jersey. Tax increases did not solve the budget deficit in California. And it is my sincere hope that when we look forward to the Committee on Rules action later this week, that even if we are allowed to debate this issue and we lose, that at the very least we should be able to debate and offer Republican alternatives, including the budget substitute of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and including the immunization alternative developed by my colleagues on the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the Committee on Ways and Means, and the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, the agricultural community is being asked to shoulder an unfair unequal portion of the energy and barge user fee taxes.

The energy tax hits farmers three times: Higher production costs, higher indirect costs, and higher transportation costs. Production agriculture can not pass on these increased costs. The impact is only compounded by the fact that farmers are also consumers and will have to pay higher prices on their consumer products due to the energy tax.

Many articles have reported that agriculture interests were protected when the Ways and Means Committee adopted the Democrat amendment regarding a Btu tax exemption. Here's the rest of the story.

The Ways and Means Committee attempted to make the Btu tax more palatable to the agricultural community by exempting diesel fuel utilized for off-road purposes from the supplemental Btu tax of \$.342 per million Btu's. This reduced the tax that farmers will pay on diesel fuel from 8.37 cents per gallon to 3.59 cents per gallon.

Assuming that approximately 95 percent of the 2.8 billion gallons of diesel fuel used per year on the farm qualifies for the limited exemption, it would reduce the farmers' cost for the Btu tax on diesel from \$232 million to \$107 million per year.

However, some of this savings is reclaimed, as the Ways and Means Committee raised the basic Btu rate from \$.257 per million Btu to \$.268 per million Btu's to offset the exemption given to agriculture. This has the impact of raising the Btu tax on other energy utilized in agriculture by \$12 million.

Custom harvesters will be devastated by the proposed Btu tax. Energy is the very core of the harvesting business. Each year roughly 48,000 gallons of fuel is consumed by the harvesting operations. The energy tax could increase their operating costs by more than \$4,000 a year.

Custom harvesters face further problems from another proposal in the budget plan which would reduce the deductibility of their

meals to only 50 percent. This would increase harvesters' costs by another \$1,000.

The American Farm Bureau has estimated that the proposed Btu tax and the adjustments in farm program payments will cost farmers \$1.7 billion per year when fully implemented. When President Clinton promised during his campaign not to raise taxes on the middle class, I am sure the rural communities did not know that he intended to do this by lowering incomes. Full-time commercial farmers will see their incomes reduced over \$2,500 per year due to lower revenues as a result of the tax plan.

Despite cutbacks in other areas of the USDA budget, the administration proposed that \$7.3 billion be added to the Food Stamp Program. The irony of the proposed budget is the fact that the administration is requesting approximately \$4 billion for low income energy assistance to offset that impact of the Btu tax. In other words, the reason that the agriculture budget is reduced by \$3 billion per year is to pay for the increased food stamp assistance which is necessary due to the Btu tax. The effect on farmers is compounded by this act; higher input costs due to the energy tax and lower farm program payments.

Unfortunately, the higher cost to agriculture does not end there. The House Ways and Means Committee proposal also contains a very convoluted provision which requires diesel fuel to be dyed different colors depending on whether the fuel will be used for on-road or off-road vehicles.

This provision will require most commercial farmers, who have trucks and pickups that run on diesel fuel, to purchase new diesel fuel storage tanks and pumping equipment to separate the two fuels. The cost of such equipment will probably average between \$1,000 and \$1,200 per unit. Somewhere between 400,000 and 500,000 farms will most likely have to install such equipment. The total capital cost for the agricultural community will be \$500 million. Therefore, the annual capital replacement costs plus annual operation and maintenance costs will be about \$70 million per year just to separate their diesel fuel.

Farm cooperative suppliers and other petroleum marketers will also feel the impact of this dyeing proposal. The cost of installing a 12,000-gallon tank for a distribution facility is approximately \$30,000 to \$35,000. This estimate from Mobil Oil.

In addition to all the above costs, there is another area that has been seldom mentioned in the discussion of the Btu tax proposal. The administration's Btu tax proposal rescinds a 22.5 cent per gallon special tax on fuel set to expire September 30, 1995. This tax was part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, which increased the manufacturer's excise tax on these fuels by 5 cents per gallon effective December 1, 1990, and extended the expiration date for these taxes, formally September 30, 1993, to September 30, 1995. Half of the increased 2.5 cents per gallon goes to the general fund of the Treasury for deficit reduction rather than to the Transportation trust fund. Therefore, these taxes were not and continue to not be subject to the off-road fuel exemption. This will cost the agriculture industry \$105 million per year.

The Ways and Means Committee added insult to agriculture's injuries by adopting the

proposal to strike the exemption for ethanol, a product of corn, from the Btu tax. The committee provided exemptions for other renewable fuels. Few things are as renewable as corn, especially in the State of Iowa.

This budget package increases farmers energy and input costs, decreases market development for ethanol, and lowers farm program payments—but wait that's not all—

INLAND WATERWAY USER FEE

President Clinton has proposed a \$1.00 phase in increase of the inland waterways diesel fuel tax by 1997. This tax will have a significant impact on methods and patterns of transportation. Presently, the barge industry pays a fuel tax of 17 cents per gallon. In 1994 the tax is scheduled to increase to 19 cents per gallon. The current fuel tax is used to fund new waterway construction projects. The new additional tax will be used to fund all operations and maintenance costs of the Corps of Engineers.

Six Democrats on the Ways and Means Committee signed a 4-page letter to Chairman ROSTENKOWSKI which outlined the parameters of the devastating effects of the barge tax. The members recognized that the proposed tax could have a very expensive environmental price tag. My colleagues stated that "Eliminating even one small river tow of 12 barges could add 720 tractor trailers to the highways with resultant air pollution, traffic congestion, wear and tear on the roads, and higher consumer costs."

The letter stated that the barge industry is capable of moving 1 ton of commodity 514 miles per gallon compared to 202 miles per gallon for the rail industry and 59.2 miles per gallon for the trucking industry. Further, these members of the Ways and Means Committee stated, "Major grain producing areas which would be affected as a result of increased costs include those in the Columbia River Basin and the Mississippi and the Missouri River Basins." These members asked that this proposal be deferred until the administration and Congress had conducted a complete review of the environmental and export-market impact. Although it appeared that these members understood the potential for very far reaching dramatic impacts of this tax proposal, these members voted to raise the barge tax by 50 cents instead of the \$1.00. So, it will just take a bit longer for the devastation to unfold.

If this fuel tax is imposed on the barge industry it will have a stifling effect not only on the barge industry but also on the agriculture and coal industries, and on rural communities along the river which depend on the waterway for its lifeblood. The administration contends that "[t]he economic impacts upon the system and its users will not be excessive". Recall that the proposal by the administration was a 525-percent tax increase. The amended version which was introduced and passed by the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, imposes only a 262.5-percent on the industry.

Sinking the barge industry would have a wide-ranging economic impact. Barges transport 15 percent of the Nation's goods including more than half the export grain, a quarter of the coal and 30 percent of the petroleum and petroleum products in the nation.

The OMB describes inland waterways "as the most heavily subsidized form of commercial freight transportation." This is a blatant misrepresentation. CBO has calculated the Federal investment based on a percentage of the freight bill rather than on a basis of per ton-mile. The barge industry is being penalized for being efficient. If their rates were higher, CBO's formula would show that their subsidy was lower.

OMB justified the 525 percent proposed increase by stating that "Since the inland waterway system was constructed for commercial navigation beneficiaries, they should pay for all corps operation and maintenance costs". OMB's rationale incorrectly assumes that the barge industry is the sole beneficiary of the locks and dams which comprise the inland waterway system. The corps mission to operate and maintain the locks and dams is not restricted to commercial navigation, but includes flood control, hydropower, municipal and agricultural water supply, and recreation.

Passenger vessels, State, local, and Federal Government crafts and recreational vessels also use the inland waterways. However, these vessels are currently exempt from the fuel tax. There is no indication that they will share the burden of this additional fuel tax.

The recently released GAO study, "Maritime Industry: Federal Assessments Levied on Commercial Vessels" shows that waterborne commerce currently bears a heavy tax burden. Assessments levied by 12 Federal agencies on waterborne trade totaled \$1.9 billion in fiscal year 1991 alone.

The U.S. Department of Transportation measures energy efficiency by the number of Btu's required to move 1 ton of cargo 1 mile, a ton mile. Shallow draft water transportation has proven to be the most energy efficient method of freight transportation for moving bulk raw materials. A recent report by the U.S. Department of Transportation Maritime Administration compares the fuel efficiency of rail and water transport. Barges expend 433 Btu's per ton mile; while it takes 696 Btu's to move the material by rail.

ENVIRONMENTAL ADVANTAGES

The administration has taken affirmative steps to advance environmental initiatives. However proposals that divert transportation from waterways to roads and rail fly in the face of responsible environmental initiatives.

Environmentalists should be up in arms at the very proposal of barge tax due to the fact that the administration critically jeopardizes the environment. The U.S. Department of Transportation, Maritime Administration recently reported that:

Barge transportation is a low-energy form of transportation, and shifts of traffic to high-energy forms would be inconsistent with the nation's energy conservation efforts. The environmental advantages of water transport should be weighed when considering any activity that would result in a shift of cargo from the waterways to a land form of transport.

Barges are environmentally friendly, the transportation paths are away from densely populated centers. Barges are double hulled and have compartmented cargo tanks, which improves transportation safety. Conversely, virtually all railroad tank cars are equipped

with single-skin tanks. The nation will be sacrificing environmental protection by shifting from barges to rail.

For each barge load diverted to rail 10 to 40 rail cars must be utilized to carry the same tonnage. Most transportation systems cause a great deal of air and noise pollution, road traffic is the greatest offender. Conversely, barge transportation has a relatively minor impact on air quality, consumes less energy and emits an insignificant amount of noise.

BARGE FEE AND AGRICULTURE

The U.S. Corps of Engineers reported that in 1991, 73.3 million tons of agricultural products were transported on the Mississippi River and its tributaries. In 1991, 65 percent of all U.S. grain exports, a total of 63 million tons with a total value of \$10 to \$15 billion, moved on the inland waterways.

On April 5, 1993 the corps released its analysis on the effect of the proposed user fee. According to the corps, about 38 percent of the barge grain traffic would be diverted to the railroads. The corps also estimated that the additional costs to the shippers of farm products would amount to \$137 million.

Diversion of cargo to other modes of transportation does not make sense because barge transportation is the most fuel-efficient and environmentally friendly mode of transportation.

Towboats which move barges burn approximately 1 gallon of fuel for every 1 horsepower per day used. Therefore, a 5,000-horsepower tugboat burns 5,000 gallons of diesel fuel per day. Presently, at the 17 cent per gallon rate it costs the barge company \$850 a day for the fuel tax. The 50 cent fuel tax increase would increase the barge company's fuel tax costs to \$2,925 per day.

This tax would also impact the products moving upstream. Fertilizer is a major commodity which travels up river. This tax would add significant costs to farm inputs. A barge company has informed me that for every 10 cents/gallon tax increase amounts to 66.5 cents per ton delivered to Sioux City, IA. A tax of 50 cents per gallon equates to \$3.33 extra cost. Hence, the total freight bill for bringing fertilizer upstream will be roughly \$6.70 per ton.

The proposed fuel tax hits close to home. An additional fuel tax of 10 cents per gallon increases the barge company's operating costs by 4.5 to 5.0 percent. Hence, a 50 cent increase would impose transportation costs of 10 cents per bushel for grain leaving Sioux City.

In 1985 the Department of Agriculture studied an inland waterway user fee proposal that would have imposed an additional 5 cents per bushel tax or roughly an additional \$1,000 per barge load. The study showed that the farmer would bear 70 percent of this cost. Raising the barge fuel tax from 19 cents to 69 cents will equate to roughly a \$6,900 a day tax increase for a barge that burns 10,000 gallons of fuel. This will also be borne primarily by the farmer. The National Grain and Feed Association estimates that this tax will cause declines in annual farm income of up to \$220 million per year, just in those States which border the waterways.

The administration has not considered the impacts of the barge fuel tax proposal on transportation infrastructure. Since the enact-

ment of the Staggers Act of 1980, the number of major rail carriers has been substantially reduced through mergers and consolidation. The remaining rail carriers naturally exercise significantly greater power in a now substantially deregulated environment.

Since the late 1980's, agricultural rail shippers have experienced significant periods during each marketing year when rail cars have not been available for timely shipment of grain and oilseeds. This has resulted in lost market opportunities and lower cash prices for local producers. The disparity of this situation will only be accelerated by this tax on barge fuel.

Exports of U.S. grains and coal are directly impacted by taxes and user fees because the prices are determined by worldwide supply and demand. It is very unlikely that this proposed increase in transportation costs could be passed on to foreign buyers who have a large choice of alternative suppliers.

The recent GAO study reports that a typical 50,000 metric ton shipment of corn from New Orleans to Japan via the Panama Canal incurs \$120,423 in maritime and user fees. The proposed \$0.50 increase in the inland waterways fuel tax would add another \$136,800 in costs to such a shipment, bringing the total taxes and user fees associated with a typical export of corn to a staggering \$257,223 or \$5.14 per metric ton.

This barge fuel tax increases the cost of coal in addition to the Btu tax. Currently, the fuel cost for coal exported from the Ohio Valley is \$3.29 per ton from the Kanawha River to the Gulf of Mexico would rise to \$5.50 per ton when the \$0.50 fuel tax is imposed. Fuel costs for the iron and steel industries would dramatically rise—from \$1.18 per ton to \$2.00 per ton for hauls from Big Sandy to Pittsburgh.

Electricity generation costs would rise. Eighty percent of the barged coal goes to electric utilities, and half of the Nation's electricity comes from coal. One electric utility, Southern Co., estimates that the \$0.50 tax will raise its annual coal bill by \$10.5 million. For electric utilities, adjusting to higher coal prices will be more complex than merely passing on the increase to consumers.

OMB'S RESPONSE

On May 13, 1993, the Office of Management and Budget responded to some of the questions regarding the proposed inland waterway user fee which arose during the Ways and Means Committee markup session on the fiscal year 1994 budget reconciliation bill.

The OMB reiterated that it was the administration's intent to increase the barge fuel tax to recover the cost of operation and maintenance of the inland waterway. OMB stated that it is the administration's intent that the increased fee be imposed upon the users of the system. There is one very simple flaw to this proposed tax—the burden is not shared by all the users; in fact only one industry bears the costs—barges, not the recreational user, not the home owner that benefits from the flood control which the waterway provides, not the power company or municipality which uses the waterway for power production—only the barge industry pays the bill.

OMB recognized that the tax may have some impact on the industry, but recommended that "the phase-in process should properly be begun while any questions about

the data are resolved." It appears that OMB would rather wait and see the extent of the devastation on the barge industry and rural communities before considering altering the tax increase.

OMB further stated, "the administration recognizes that there will be some economic impacts in moving toward a user fee that covers the full costs of the system, regardless of the merits of doing so. However, the administration believes that the pain of that transition will be less than some observers have suggested." OMB contends the estimates by the Corp of Engineers that approximately 38 percent of the barge grain traffic, approximately 30,278 tons, will be diverted to rail are too high. However, OMB did admit that it estimated that up to 25 percent of the grain transported would be redirected to rails—only 19,780 tons.

OMB does not believe that rail rates will increase as a result of the increase in the Inland Waterway user fee. Although, a recent study by Food and Agricultural Policy Research Institute, University of Missouri indicates that rail rates increase roughly 3 cents for every 10-cent increase in barge rates. The report further stated that the proposed increase in the barge user fee would directly affect the cost of transporting grain down river to the ocean terminals as well as moving fertilizer inland.

However, in the next breath OMB acknowledge that farm income would decline and that deficiency payments would probably increase, but declared that the decreased income taxes paid by farmers would be offset by the additional income taxes paid by railroads.

The merchandising margins in the coal, agricultural products, and commodity areas are very narrow, as are the operating margins of most barge carriers. A tax increase of this magnitude is larger than the combined margins of both the export grain and barge industries. Obviously, this tax cannot be absorbed by these industries.

The only segment remaining to absorb this tax is the producer himself. A 1985 study by the Department of Agriculture showed that the farmer would incur 75 percent of a \$0.05 per bushel fuel tax. Therefore, the farmer will receive less for his products. Further, the USDA has reported that a \$0.05 per bushel decline in corn price would cause additional government costs ranging from \$300 to \$500 million for corn and feed grains alone. The Federal Government would incur additional program costs due to lower wheat and soybean prices.

The American Farm Bureau estimates that farm revenues will be reduced by almost \$150 million per year as it will be the farmer paying for the increased shipping costs due to the fact the barge company can not pass the costs forward and still deliver a product at a competitive price to the world market.

The present proposal estimates revenues in 1997 from this tax to be \$486 million. However, this estimate is based on traffic volume remaining constant or even increasing slightly. It is highly unlikely that the barge industry will thrive when burdened with a tax of this magnitude.

SUMMARY

U.S. farmers will pay an additional \$992 million per year for the Clinton Btu tax when fully implemented and see their farm program ben-

efits and cash receipts from sales decline by over \$700 million per year, a total \$1.7 billion per year hit on agriculture. While this will range from a few dollars a year for small, part-time farmers to several thousand dollars per year for large farmers, the average will probably be about \$2,500 per year for the typical commercial farmer. Moreover, the Btu tax is set to be indexed when fully implemented so it will be increasing each succeeding year.

When the agriculture sector experiences lower incomes; all of the rural community suffers due to the fact that farmers invest locally. They invest in agricultural businesses through the purchases of machinery, buildings, and supplies. Farmers also greatly contribute to the communities through development projects; whether it is for a new show arena at the county fair grounds or community park system.

Agriculture is known for being the backbone of America, but it should not shoulder an astonishing proportion of the tax burden.

Consequently, this tax proposal is not only highly costly to the farm sector in the short term, but it will also be highly inflationary to agriculture and the general economy over the long run.

Vice President GORE stated in his book, "Earth in the Balance," "More than anything else, my study has led me to realize the extent to which our current public discourse is focused on the shortest of short-term values and encourages the American people to join us politicians in avoiding the most important issues and postponing the really difficult choices." It will be costly if we adopt this very short-sighted proposal. We must have the foresight to see the potential for very dramatic and devastating effects of the Btu and barge fuel taxes on the agricultural and rural communities. We must protect the future of agriculture and vote against the budget proposal.

SUMMARY OF COST AND REVENUE CHANGES STEMMING FROM THE CLINTON TAX PLAN (In millions of dollars)

	Original	Revised ¹
Btu Tax	1,000	887
Continue 2.5 cents special tax	105	105
Extra cost, separate diesel tank		70
Inland waterways tax (net)	300	150
Reduced farm program benefits	600	600
Total annual cost to farmers	2,005	1,707

¹ Based on revised House Ways and Means Committee (Btu tax) and House Agriculture Committee (Farm Program benefits) changes.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for reserving time tonight to discuss a very important issue, the President's proposed energy tax. Most Americans probably have not focused on this issue. When you start trying to understand how this tax would be levied and collected your eyes can glaze over and many people probably assume it will not affect them. But they are wrong.

This is a tax that will hit and hurt everyone in this country. It will increase the cost of energy in your home, it will increase the cost to produce and buy consumer goods and services, and will reduce our competitiveness in a global economy, that is, this tax will cost American jobs.

As part of his economic package the President has proposed a number of new taxes, in-

cluding a new comprehensive energy tax based on the heat output, or British thermal unit [Btu], of various forms of energy such as coal, oil, natural gas, and nuclear power. Much of the impact of the President's tax package on the middle class will come indirectly through the proposed new energy tax. On average, the American family of four would pay approximately \$500 more per year.

This tax is inequitable for a number of reasons. For one, it is an extremely regressive tax, costing low-income groups a greater percentage of income than the affluent. It is inequitable in that it proposes to raise 22 percent of the new revenues from an energy sector representing only 8 percent of the economy.

It is also geographically imbalanced. It could prove devastating to the industrial Midwest, a region of the country which has yet to feel the full brunt of the recently enacted Clean Air Act Amendments. Ohio's energy sector is already poised to take a hit from the substantial expense of complying with the Clean Air Act. Compliance costs will actually peak in the 1997 to 2000 period, precisely the time the Btu tax burden reaches its peak.

Ohio, for example, ranks third in terms of total energy consumption and electricity consumption. Accordingly any energy tax will have a substantial impact on Ohio consumers both residential and industrial. A broad based energy tax is counterproductive to the President's goals, which I share, of improving economic growth and employment opportunities. In fact I believe it will result in slowed growth and cost American jobs by making our goods and services less competitive in the global market place.

Ohio and the Midwest in general, have been leaders in the Nation's economic resurgence. Manufacturing and exporting have been at the heart of the economic turnaround. The energy tax poses a substantial threat to some of the most successful and competitive elements of the Ohio economy and for many other regions dependent on heavy industry, manufacturing, and exports.

Just a cursory review of the estimated impacts in Ohio alone are cause for concern. The Btu tax would take \$1.3 billion from Ohio consumers and businesses, representing a 6.3-percent increase in the State's total energy costs. Three out of every ten manufacturing jobs in Ohio are in energy-intensive industries, 25 percent more than the national average. One out of every six Ohio manufacturing jobs is tied to exports, 10 percent more than the national average. The Btu tax would hit imported oil—but not energy-intensive imported products like cars, trucks, steel, et cetera, which would take jobs away from Ohio.

As a major industrial, energy-intensive State, Ohio would pay nearly 6 percent—three times its share—of the estimated \$22 billion raised yearly by the energy tax.

The proposed Btu tax is estimated to cost 24,200 jobs in Ohio alone and 400,000 to 600,000 nationally adding about one-half of 1 percent to the unemployment rate. Revenue estimates for this tax have not factored in added costs such as the attendant unemployment costs. An analysis by the Ohio Inter-Agency Task Force on the energy tax concluded that Ohio could lose six times as many

jobs under an energy tax as it would under equivalent levels of reduced Government spending.

Energy costs are a key component in the cost of manufacturing and, one advantage U.S. industries currently enjoy over virtually all of their foreign competition, is lower energy prices. Despite increases in U.S. commercial/industrial electricity rates during the last 2 years, U.S. rates remain among the least expensive compared to rates in industrialized countries worldwide according to a survey by National Utility Service. If we are to strengthen the economy it will come in large measure through improving our competitive position in the global market place.

In recognition of this other nations are now starting to reduce energy taxes. Sweden, for example, has lowered its energy tax on manufacturing companies by 85 percent.

Other nations also enjoy other competitive advantages. For example we burden U.S. industries with costs related to such matters as OSHA, workers' compensation, EPA regulations, product liability, and so on, that many of our foreign competitors do not have to contend with. Raising the cost of energy in the United States will deprive U.S. industry of one of its few advantages and place our global competitiveness in further jeopardy.

As a member who has dealt with energy issues for many years I know that most people simply take its availability and affordability for granted. The last time most Americans probably focused on energy was the 1973 Arab oil embargo when we all sat in gasoline lines. We focused then. Since then energy has been relatively cheap and plentiful. In fact, the price of gasoline today, when adjusted for inflation, is lower than it was in 1947.

A story former Speaker Jim Wright use to tell is particularly illustrative of our country's general perspective on energy. The Speaker told of a constituent who called him and said he was really worried about energy. Nuclear, he feared was just not safe. Oil and gas posed environmental problems in terms of developing our offshore resources. And coal was just too dirty. What do you suggest we use queried the Speaker? His constituents response: "Let's just use electricity."

This energy tax reminds me a little of that. What you don't see won't hurt you, but this tax will hurt.

In general, the energy tax harms the economy nationwide by reducing the overall level of business activity—especially new investments that are critical for growth. Taxing the sectors of the economy that need to grow will only stifle economic growth.

A study prepared by the National Association of Manufacturers indicates that within 4 years the real Gross Domestic Product would be lowered by between \$105 billion and \$140 billion and between 1.5 and 2.3 million jobs would be lost. Energy and capital are complementary and thus an energy tax will result in a lower level of capital investment. This will impede productivity gains and make U.S. production less competitive. All manufacturing industries in the United States will suffer.

The Btu tax will place most U.S. industries at a substantial competitive disadvantage in world markets. Access to reasonably priced energy resources is one of the United States'

competitive edges in the global market. Increasing energy costs would disadvantage companies that export their products to foreign markets. The export will become American jobs as industrial production moves overseas to avoid higher overall costs in the United States imposed through the energy tax.

An energy tax has been touted as encouraging conservation. I support that goal, but believe the way this particular tax is structured, limited conservation gains will be realized. Moreover, while total oil imports would decline, foreign oil would enjoy a cost advantage over U.S. oil, because the energy used in the process of exploring for oil and refining foreign petroleum products would not be taxed. That cost advantage for foreign oil would likely give foreign producers a larger share of the U.S. petroleum market than before the tax.

The message I have gotten from my constituents is not enough has been done on the spending side of the equation. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I could argue that we have cut spending. Despite the relatively small share of the pie the appropriations process can effect, the record has been good. In the 18 years since the Budget Act was enacted in 1974, Congress has appropriated \$72 billion less than requested by the Presidents. In 1993, for example, appropriations bills totaled \$9.2 billion less than requested for discretionary spending. These cuts were achieved in all three categories, domestic, international, and military.

For over a decade Congress has focused on only a part of the equation—the appropriations process. All the angst over deficits has found its only outlet through criticizing annual appropriations bills, whether they be for defense or health care.

Very few people recognize that only one-half of all Federal spending goes through the annual appropriations process. The remainder is mandatory or entitlement spending and interest on the debt. And even though one-half of all spending is appropriated—only 35 percent of the total is truly discretionary. The other 15 percent that is appropriated consists of appropriated entitlements that we cannot easily adjust without changing the authorizing legislation.

The Ohio Governor's task force concluded that reduced Government spending is more balanced and does far less damage to the economy, while providing the same deficit reduction benefits. If Ohio is any barometer the American people want us to take a harder look at the spending side of the equation before we act to impose the largest new tax burden in the Nation's history.

Additional spending cuts, fewer regulations, and business incentives should all be explored before imposing this potentially devastating new tax. We should consider incentives for growth in productivity, industrial investment, and exports—the true sources of job growth in a world economy. We should also explore incentives for energy efficiency and environmental improvements that directly support the environmental goals of the administration's proposal without incurring their inherent economic risks.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

□ 2030

BUDGET RECONCILIATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, this week we are scheduled to vote on the budget reconciliation bill, which will lock into place President Clinton's deficit reduction package, which is one of the three integral pieces in the administration's economic plan to rebuild America.

Before taking too seriously Republican congressional criticism of President Clinton's pending deficit reduction plan, I would like to review some facts.

Chart 1 demonstrates what the history of deficits has been since the end of World War II, and that chart demonstrates that we have never experienced a deficit larger than \$74 billion until the day Ronald Reagan walked into office and suggested that we pass his deficit reduction package, which, in plain English, never got there. The deficit reduction package that was promised by President Reagan, in fact, wound up exploding deficits, so we were running deficits well above \$200 billion a year, as can be demonstrated on the right of this green line.

Chart 2 demonstrates the difference between the Reagan performance and Reagan promise on deficit reduction. The Reagan promise, in 1981, was that if we passed their budget the deficit would decline, as represented by these white bars, from \$55 billion in 1981 down to zero by 1984. The red bars demonstrate how performance varied from that promise, with deficits rising to over \$200 billion.

Recognizing that they were then in trouble, the Reagan administration again tried a second strategy to control the deficit. They proposed Gramm-Rudman I. That plan suggested, as these green bars demonstrate, that if we passed their plan the deficit would decline in nice, neat, \$36 billion increments from \$172 billion down to zero in 1990.

The red bars demonstrate that again, performance did not match promise, because the deficits continued to stay in the \$200 billion range. They never dropped below \$150 billion.

When Gramm-Rudman I did not work in attacking the deficit, the administration then proposed magic trick No. 3, which was Gramm-Rudman II, and again they said, as represented by these green bars, that if we just passed their economic program we would take the deficit from \$144 billion in 1987 down to zero by 1992. Again, performance did not match promise, and we wound up today inheriting a \$290 billion deficit.

Now President Clinton has proposed a plan to try to get those deficits under control over the next few years. This

chart demonstrates what is projected to happen to the Federal deficit under the economic policies that President Clinton inherited from the previous administration. The chart demonstrates that the deficits that are \$290 billion today are expected to rise to \$361 billion by 1998.

To try to turn this line downward, President Clinton has proposed a combination of spending cuts and revenue increases which, if adopted, are expected to cut \$150 billion off the projected deficit in that 4th year, as demonstrated by this green line. This green line demonstrates how the deficit is expected to drop under the President's plan in comparison to what will happen on the orange track if we continue existing policy.

This plan is being attacked by the President's critics because they are saying, "Oh, it is nice, but, you know, the problem is, it does not really cut enough in terms of the deficit," or "The mix between taxes and spending is not quite right."

I would suggest that the President's plan does not look all that bad in comparison to the missed-by-a-mile record of his critics in this Congress over the past 12 years.

His critics have centered on the Btu tax as a tax which they say they do not like. Who does like the Btu tax? We would all prefer to have no Btu tax and no taxes of any kind. However, after 12 years of feeding the American public nonsense, after 12 years of the easy-answer boys in this House, telling the entire country that somehow you can get there with no real pain in spending reductions and no real revenue increases, thank God, we finally have a President who recognizes that we have to level with the American people and admit honestly that we are not going to be able to successfully attack that deficit without both spending reductions and revenue increases.

Now his opponents are making a lot of political charges about the Btu tax. I want to demonstrate that under the President's proposal, even if we include all indirect as well as direct tax effects under that proposal, the President's package, including the Btu tax, will wind up reducing taxes on persons making less than \$20,000 a year.

The average monthly increase, if we include direct as well as indirect, if we include anything that is possible to be calculated under the wildest stretch of the imagination, the increase in taxation for someone in the \$30,000 to \$40,000 level is only about \$13 per month.

That is not pleasant, but it is a whole lot more responsible than simply saying, "Well, we are going to continue to tell people they can afford to avoid even that small sacrifice on a monthly basis, and instead shovel the load off on their kids, who just graduated from high school or college over the last couple of weeks."

I think this chart needs to be put in perspective. Consider it in the perspective of what has happened over the past decade and what is projected to happen under the President's plan by comparison. This chart shows who got what in the 1980's. It shows how your share of the national income changed from 1980, when Ronald Reagan walked into office, until today. It demonstrates that the bottom 20 percent of earners in this country lost, as a share of national income, 17 percent. It demonstrates that you did not get to be a real winner until you got to be in the top 5 percent of the population by income, and you did not get to really clean up unless you were in the top 1 percent, in which case your share of national income, the top 1 percent, rose by 60 percent over that time, the time that the President's critics were in control of what happened in this country.

This chart demonstrates—you remember when we had the budget summit in 1990, which was the fourth administration effort to fix the problem under President Bush? President Bush endorsed the first summit package that came out of that conference, and what this chart demonstrates is that the tax increases that George Bush endorsed at that time imposed a tax increase on people who made less than \$10,000 a year, more than four times as large as the tax-rate increase that was proposed for people who made more than \$200,000 a year.

□ 2040

And for people between \$20,000 and \$50,000, it proposed a tax increase which was 50 percent higher than the tax increase proposed for those making \$200,000 a year.

Compare that chart to this one. This chart demonstrates what the distribution in monthly tax burden will be under the President's package. If you are below \$10,000, you actually have a reduction in taxes. If you are below \$20,000, you actually have a reduction in taxes. If you are at \$40,000, the direct costs to a taxpayer is \$14 a month. Even if you are making \$200,000 a year, your tax bill will increase only \$64 a month. It is only when you get above \$200,000 a year in income that you have a heavy tax hit. That tax hit under the President's plan average \$1,900 a month, and I do not apologize for 1 dollar of that.

These are the people who were on the gravy train in the 1980's. They are the people who ought to be paying a much larger share of the revenue intake in this country so that other people with far more limited means do not have to pay more than their fair share.

So basically, I believe these two charts demonstrate the difference in the tax distribution which the Republican White House occupant was willing to impose on the American people in 1990 versus the dramatic change in

direction in terms of burden being proposed by President Clinton under his package. And keep in mind that these tax changes are accompanied by very major spending reductions, spending reductions which over the next 5 years total \$246 billion, including \$13 billion in pay reductions for Federal employees, \$24 billion from eliminating excess Federal workers, \$9.5 billion from reducing pensions and retirement costs for Federal retirees, caps on Medicare payments going to doctors, hospitals, and laboratory, billions of dollars in other savings that are equally as painful. Anyone who thinks that the spending cuts in the President's package are not going to be tough to impose does not understand the human condition and does not understand human nature.

So these are the basic facts. The fact is that America has suffered through 12 years of skyrocketing deficits while incomes soared for the wealthiest Americans and sagged for everybody else in the society. And now the very same characters in this Capitol Building who were responsible for voting for the Reagan budgets and the Gramm-Rudman I, Gramm-Rudman II, and the other magic fixes from the wizards who ran this country in the 1980's, those very same characters are now trying to bring down the only package available that has a chance to reduce the inequity that was produced in terms of income distribution and tax distribution in the 1980's. And it is the only package in town which has a prayer of reducing deficits long term.

There is an old adage which says fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. In my judgment, the President's critics have failed the country three times running with their deficit reduction promises and their ideological economic dogma. Do they really deserve another chance?

Is it not time to break with them and the failed past which they represent? I believe these charts demonstrate clearly that it is. That is why we must pass the President's reconciliation package this week. It is one of three key parts in bringing down the deficit, restoring economic growth, restoring family income growth, and correcting the miscarriage of justice which occurred in the 1980's when the wealthiest people in this society got the lion's share of the benefits, people who are now being asked for the first time in 12 long years to finally pay their fair share of the Nation's bills.

I say it is about time. I think we need to get on with the job and do it this week.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I am happy to yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for a very fine statement and for the number of facts that he has brought out that I think

are very, very important that people need to consider as they look at this reconciliation bill that the President has brought forward. I think what the gentleman said about the necessity of deficit reduction is absolutely correct. In my view, the deficit is a dagger pointed at the economic heart of this country, and after 12 years of inaction on the deficit, it is now time that we have to take the responsibility for dealing with the deficit.

In my view we had institutional irresponsibility for 12 years that produced a \$4 trillion debt. We now have the chance, and we are at the crossroads where we have to take the responsibility and lead toward a conclusion which will bring this deficit under control.

A lot of people are saying that there are not enough spending cuts in the plan. I think, I may be wrong, but I think this is the largest spending cut proposal that we have ever seen. The gentleman set out the kind of cuts we are looking at. Agricultural entitlement cuts, \$3 billion; Federal workers, \$11 billion. As the gentleman said, there are 30 specific cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that reduce the deficit by \$56 billion, \$11 billion in Federal administrative costs, \$2.2 billion streamlining education programs, \$1 billion out of highway demonstration projects, and \$3 billion in veterans' program cuts.

Nobody likes to talk about cuts. One of my problems in discussing this bill is that everybody is for cuts in general, but nobody wants to talk about cuts in specific. That has been our problem for the last 12 years. People want to talk about a balanced budget amendment, or they want to talk about a cap on entitlements, or they want to talk about some other process gimmick, the Gramm-Rudman, or Gramm-Latta, or some other gizmo that is going to solve our problems.

The truth is there is no solution to the budget problem unless there are specific suggestions of cuts, and that is what President Clinton has had the courage to do. And what the committees of the Congress here have brought to the floor are specific recommendations for cuts.

Nobody likes taxes. I hate taxes. I wish we did not have to have one tax. But if we are going to have taxes as part of the solution, and I think we must, because the cuts are deep indeed, then the taxes that have been presented are the fairest taxes we have seen for over 12 years. As the gentleman's chart shows, the taxes are taxes on the wealthiest people in the country. This is not soak-the-rich. We are not after rich people. We do not want to do anything to harm rich people. We want more rich people in this country. But the wealthy, like everybody else, have to pay their fair share, and the chart the gentleman shows right next to him shows that under the 1990 budg-

et agreement that we negotiated with George Bush, the poorest people in the country were bearing the worst part of the burden and the richest people, the lowest part of the burden.

Under the Clinton plan on top it is the highest people that are taking the highest burden.

The chart to my right shows again 66 percent share of the taxes for people over \$200,000; 75 percent of the taxes come from people over \$100,000.

A lot of people are saying well, they do not like this tax, or that tax or the other tax. Fine. We have said tell us the alternative in spending cuts that will take care of that tax. People want to get very general then. They do not want to be specific. We have got to be specific about the spending cuts.

We have an alternative in the other body where Members, Republicans and Democrats, have come up with an alternative. The problem I see with the alternative is that it is more of the same from the past. It is another budget from the past.

It is a budget that says, "Let us not tax the people who are the wealthiest in the country so much; let us give them a capital-gains break." It says, "Let us lower the taxation for Medicare on those folks who make over \$100,000 a year. Let us do other things that will help people at the very top, and let us increase taxes on people at the bottom by lowering the earned-income credit which is the most important thing for progressivity in the Clinton budget," that is in this reconciliation bill.

And, yes, "Let us cut Social Security COLA, let us cut Medicare, and let us cut Medicaid again." I am not for that, and I think if you put that alternative on the floor, you would not get many votes for it on either side of the aisle. If you put it in the other body, I suspect it might be the same.

We have problems in this country today with being specific about what we want to do. President Clinton has been specific. He has put a concrete proposal in front of us and our committees have brought that proposal forward. It is a good proposal.

We are at crossroads in the country. Either we deal with this problem that is eating us alive, or we do not.

Now, people say, "Gee, I am against that Btu tax. It is going to cost me in the third year," and remember it is phased in, but in the third year for an average family of four, it is going to cost us \$15 or \$17 a month.

What they are not looking at is that if we can get this proposal through, interest rates will be held down over the next 3 years to an extent where they will get much more benefit than the costs of the Btu tax. Jobs will be created, the recovery will go forward, we will not fall back into another recession, we will begin to get economic growth in this society.

We do not do a deficit-reduction plan as an academic exercise. It is not to make somebody in a university feel good who studies economics. It is to get concrete results in the economy in the country. We are trying to create jobs. We are trying to hold inflation down. We are trying to hold interest rates down, and we are trying to stay out of another recession that we have been in now for 3 years.

I was at home the other day with the unemployment people, and a fellow who has been in the unemployment office for 30 years said he has never seen recovery like this. He said, "Congressman, there are no jobs." He said "I can get minimum-wage jobs, people who want to work at McDonald's. We have got plenty of those. What we do not have are good jobs."

I do not know how we get good jobs created in this society unless we do something real about the deficit, unless we stand up finally and say, "Here is a program that will get the deficit down over the next 5 years," not smoke and mirrors, not another gimmick, not another gizmo, not another promise, and not another illusion; something that works and is real. That is what we are talking about with this plan, and I believe it is fair. I believe it is balanced, and I think we have to show the leadership and the responsibility to go forward and pass this plan, get it through the Senate, put it on the President's desk as quickly as possible, and move this country and this economy in a positive direction.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman very much for his comments.

Let me simply say that I think he has summed up the situation exactly on point.

My message to anyone concerned, for instance, about the Btu tax is I would invite farmers in my State, for instance, to recall that just 90 days ago they were terrified, and so were we, of being hit with a large gasoline tax such as that proposed by Mr. Perot, 10 cents a gallon, and we have had proposals for 10-cents-a-gallon increase each year for 5 years. That would extract a huge amount of money from the pockets of the farmers that all of us represent in this country.

This Btu tax, by comparison, has a much smaller hit.

I would also point out that I would say to those who are concerned about the Btu tax and would like to escape that 3-year, \$14 or \$17 a month that it will cost them in the third year when it is fully effective, I would simply say, "Take a look at your kids as they are leaving high school and leaving college and ask yourself what kind of job opportunity you have available for them."

My youngest son just graduated from the University of Wisconsin 2 weeks ago. The job market that he is facing today is far tougher than the job mar-

ket that faced my oldest son 10 years ago, and it is much, much tougher than the job market that faced the gentleman or me when we graduated from college quite a few more years ago than I would care to talk about, but it just seems to me that this is a question of whether this generation of adults has the responsibility to make a small contribution in order to make the job market, the retirement market, the lifestyle market for their kids a little bit better than it otherwise is going to be, and in some cases a whole lot better.

I would also suggest that for those who think that a plan such as the Boren plan in the other body, which has been offered, if they think that that is the answer by eliminating \$40 billion in taxes on the very wealthy and by increasing the hit on Social Security recipients and the poor by \$40 billion as that plan does, if they think that is the answer, they must be talking to different human beings than I am talking to when I go back to my district each week. To me, when I go back to my district, my constituents are telling me one thing: "Give the President a chance. He is the only President we have got, and he is going to be the only one we have for 4 years. Do not destroy him out of the box. We elected him, back him," and I would say that I simply agree with that.

What is our alternative? Are we going to turn it over again to the same naysayers who really drove policy in this country for 12 years and drove this country into the ditch? I hope to God the answer is not yes to that question.

The President's option is the only real one before us. We have got an obligation to move it forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. THURMAN].

Mrs. THURMAN. I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] that I want to kind of go back to some of the things he has been talking about, particularly with the other plans, because as he well knows during this debate, there has been the issue of what is going to happen in the Senate.

One of the things that I keep hearing about is Senator BOREN's and Senator DANFORTH's replacement. I come from a district that is probably two-thirds seniors.

Can the gentleman give us a little more detail of what is going to happen under that with Social Security? I mean, I have heard things that people around the \$7,500 mark are going to be taxed more under that plan, where this plan does not do any of those kinds of things. I mean, there are a lot of issues in here that I think we need to be talking about so that the American public understands that the alternatives are deeper cuts for people who can least afford it.

Mr. OBEY. Well, I do not know how much detail the Senator has gone into, and I do not know how much of his pro-

gram would survive actual action by specific committees.

But all I would say is that my understanding of the Boren plan, for instance, is that it takes a much larger hit on Social Security recipients. When people talk about entitlements, that is a nice, neutral political word, but when you get behind that moniker, what it means is you are talking about Medicare, you are talking about Medicaid, you are talking about food stamps, you are talking about unemployment compensation, you are talking about Social Security.

I am not about to support a package which has an extra \$40 billion or \$50 billion hit on those folks.

Mrs. THURMAN. And including what already is being hit, I understand, in the package we are looking at?

Mr. OBEY. I was amused by the fact that we heard some of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle tonight bemoaning the modest actions we have in President Clinton's package with respect to senior citizens on Social Security, and yet we are being asked in the next breath to support something like the Boren plan which has a much larger hit on those same folks.

I know that people often try to have it both ways in this place, but that seems to me to be stretching it a little much.

I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Budget, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. SABO].

Mr. SABO. I just simply wanted to thank the gentleman for taking this special order and the majority leader for his participation.

I think the message is clear. This is a huge deficit-reduction plan.

□ 2100

I think modestly stated it is about \$500 billion. Frankly, some of the calculations I do would make it significantly larger. I frankly think the administration has understated their deficit reduction requirements over the next 5 years rather than overstating them. I also have to say that they use very modest, conservative economic assumptions in their budgeting so that we can have some expectations of the projections they make for the future are real. Clearly, it is having significant impact on interest rates in this country. Interest rates are coming down.

That is good for the American public, but it is also good for the Federal budget, because one of our biggest expenditures is simply interest costs, and those are going to be less than what we projected rather than more.

I am curious that you do know while we have significant spending reductions—I wish the gentleman would review again his chart on who is asked to pay those new revenues. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin also over the years has studied what happened to

income during the 1980's. Who was it, during the 1980's, who had the greatest income growth in this country?

Mr. OBEY. The fact is that the richest 1 percent of Americans saw their income more than double from less than \$300,000 on average before Ronald Reagan walked into the White House, to over \$600,000 by the time George Bush left the White House.

So they saw their income more than double, while virtually everyone else outside of the top 10 or 15 percent lost real economic ground.

Mr. SABO. So that thick blue chart that the gentleman has there with the big blue column, that really applies to the people who had the largest real income growth during the 1980's?

Mr. OBEY. You bet. The people who went to the party in the 1980's are now finally being sent the tab, belatedly, but thank God somebody is sending it to them.

Mr. SABO. Would that marginal tax rate be higher than it was before 1981?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely not. The fact is that the marginal tax rate used to be 90 percent; then it dropped to 70 percent; then to 50 percent. It has now dropped down to less than half of that level.

So, even with the modest increases that we are getting under this package, they are still paying substantially less than they were paying before Ronald Reagan walked into the White House.

Mr. SABO. So, the marginal tax rate, the top rate they would pay, would still be much lower than what it was in 1981?

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely. In my view, we ought to raise it even further, but we would run into great resistance from our friends on this side of the aisle if we tried to do that.

You remember David Stockman, in his famous book in 1981, explained the truth when he said—his words were—"Supply-side was always trickle-down." It was a Trojan horse. This magic supply-side formula was a Trojan horse through which they drove trickle-down economics to the wall, and trickle-down economics produced a bonanza for these people at the top of the income scale, and a few drops for everyone else.

Mr. SABO. I thank the gentleman for the answers to those questions.

Mr. HUNTER. Would the gentleman yield to this side of the aisle for just a minute? I will not ask a lot of questions.

Mr. OBEY. Sure; I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank the gentleman, and I respect the gentleman and respect the time that he has taken and the illustrations he is making. I would just ask one question. That is: As I understand—and I looked at the figures the other day—although we cut marginal tax rates and, as the gentleman said a number of individuals, many of

whom own small businesses, are employers, increased their income. As I understand, total net revenues to the Government went up between 1981 and 1987 by about 70 percent. Would the gentleman comment on that?

Mr. OBEY. I am really glad the gentleman asked that question, because what we always hear is, "Oh, gee, whiz, what are we talking about? After all, we shouldn't soak these poor fellows up at the top of the ladder because, my God, when you look at what happened to the total taxes in the 1980's, their taxes went up."

Well, this chart demonstrates that is absolutely true; the total tax represented by this green piece actually did go up slightly from \$108,000 to \$163,000 for the top 1 percent of the people in this country. But that is because their income went up from around \$300,000 to almost \$600,000 over time, as represented by this red block.

So, what that demonstrates is, yes, their taxes went up a tiny bit, but the fact is that their income went up by a much larger amount.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Ms. MCKINNEY. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take an opportunity this evening to discuss, in all candor, the grave stakes that we have before us. I want the people whom I represent, as well as the people of this country, to understand, as I understand, the imperatives which face us today.

Three Sundays ago we celebrated Mother's Day. And this brings to my mind some ideas about the faith of mothers. You know, from before we are even born, mothers have faith in us. And in a mother's eyes, there is very little wrong that we can do. You see, mothers have learned to keep their eyes on the prize and to understand that life has its bumps along the way, but that it is always possible to take lemons and turn them into lemonade, to take life's bumps and turn them into stepping stones. And our mothers always have the faith that we will be so wise.

During this most important week of decision, let us also resolve that we will not betray our mother's faith. And let me commend the President for his leadership, the Budget Committee, and the Ways and Means Committee, the leadership of the House of Representatives, and the whole Democratic team, really, for crafting legislation that represents the kind of change that the American people voted for in November.

We are demonstrating that the House is ready to take up leadership and that the Democratic Party is ready to demonstrate the kind of leadership that will make this world all the better because we dared to struggle, among our-

selves and within ourselves in order to reach ever new heights.

Today, we debate nothing short of hard work and dedication, the kind of dedication and commitment to purpose that usually turns dreams into reality.

In the beginning, I am sure, becoming President was only a dream for our President. Probably no one believed in it but him—at first.

But he was able to convince his wife, his friends, and then all of us. But his dream only started because there was something deep down inside of him.

In my own case, I know that becoming a Member of Congress was a dream that only a few people close to me felt was possible. It seems that the world is full of naysayers—people love to tell you what you cannot do. But through hard work and dedication, and demonstrated commitment to purpose, we too were able to turn that something deep down inside to history-making in Georgia.

Each of us who must cast a vote this week began with the most important commitment—and that was to excellence. For when we begin with excellence, nothing short of the best will be good enough.

Well, all of us working together have come up with a legislative package for change for this country. The reconciliation bill before us contains legislation which will correct the decline that this country has experienced over the past 12 years.

Now is the time for all of us to be proud, and committed, and strong.

Strong, because life is not always easy. And when we encounter those unexpected bumps along the way, we must remain focused and committed to the goal, and turn those bumps into stepping stones.

As the Representative for Georgia's 11th Congressional District, which is Georgia's second poorest district, I am committed to providing a better Georgia and America for every child, every family, every person in my district.

For too long, the needs of ordinary Americans have been sacrificed for the needs of the wealthy. Yet, in addition to that, our President has assumed office at a time of unprecedented world instability—during a time of peace. Our President gained control of the White House after the previous President unilaterally announced a "new world order" but failed to define what it was or even what he meant.

Let us pray for our President so that the Lord's hand will guide him as he tries to make our Government more accountable to us and at the same time turn this massive ship of state in a new direction. He needs our success, and we need his success.

I am concerned about today, but also about tomorrow. But, as is usually the case, as we fight for a better tomorrow, we ought to remember the past that got us to this point. I would like for

you to recall the memory of another time in the American experience.

Thirty years ago we were in the midst of a season of discontent:

- Black people decided to sit down at lunch counters all over this country in order to stand up for freedom and justice and dignity.

- Black people decided to register to vote to change the policymakers, since they couldn't change the policies of oppression that blanketed the South and this Nation.

- Young freedom riders, both black and white, defied the racial order of apartheid and bigotry in the South and some saw their lives ended as they rode on those freedom rides of the American dream.

- Three young men—Goodwin, Cheney, and Schwerner—should never be forgotten as they rode the freedom ride to their death in Philadelphia, MS.

Goodwin, Cheney, and Schwerner should never be forgotten because they represented all that is good in America.

They were young and hopeful, willing to overlook the racism of the times, in order to do what was right for their country and for their fellow man. Well, we have just endured another long season of discontent: 12 long years—where Government served the interests of a few of us at the expense of the rest of us.

We have got to have a change.

We must understand, too, what the last 12 years have done to us as a Nation and as a people.

TV cameras were poised in Los Angeles to view the spectacle. You would have thought that the circus had come to town. But the people of Los Angeles and the people of this country just wanted justice to come to town. Thank goodness that it did—on that day.

However, not until we completely obliterate the politics of division that this country endured for the last 12 years. And remember that words and actions and deeds have ramifications. And understand the complete sense of alienation that our young people feel about this system that we call their Government, and our society will be able to properly deal with the many frustrations of being young, and black, or Latino, in America.

With one Presidential campaign begun in Philadelphia, MS, along with a message of State's rights and another Presidential campaign won on the back of a Willie Horton ad, the Republican Party has done nothing to honor the memory of the proud and strong three young men who died on that dark, dark Mississippi night.

The legacy of Republican leadership has been Iran-Contra, S&L scandal, HUD scandal, BNL scandal, war against Third World people, environmental injustice gone mad, and, most seriously, a complete neglect of this country's children. In my home State

of Georgia, we rank 47th overall in the well-being of our children.

The United States ranks 20th in the world in infant mortality rates, equal to Greece, Israel, and New Zealand—only just above Cuba by one point. And if we look at black babies, black babies die at almost twice the national rate, placing the U.S. black infant mortality rate at 33d in the world, tied with Costa Rica and just above Chile by two points.

The United States ranks 31st in the world in low birthweight babies, equal to Turkey and Paraguay and Israel, just above Jamaica and Panama. For black babies, the rank is 75th in the world, just behind Cote D'Ivoire, little better than Niger.

And while 71.3 percent of all white children are covered by employment-related insurance, that is the case for only 38 percent of black children and is only the case for 39 percent of Latino children.

Furthermore, during the 1980's, the following health trends were recognized: Access to early prenatal care—worsened; late or no prenatal care—worsened; low birthweight babies—worsened; measles increased 533 percent over 1983; mumps increased 35 percent over 1985; pertussis increased 106 percent over 1981; and rubella increased 509 percent over 1988.

Both our children and our future are at stake if we do nothing.

The stewardship of our Government over the past 12 years has seen a steady deterioration in the quality of life for our children. Yet, the enrichment of the top 1 percent of family income earners was unprecedented. The expenditures for the military-industrial complex were astronomical; and we had two Presidents who were telling us that everything was all right.

Some of us knew, however, that the last thing this country was, was all right. And we didn't hesitate to say so. In the meantime, though, middle-class incomes deteriorated; the budget deficit grew to unprecedented proportions; health care costs became unbearable to most of us; and our President said that the United States was the strongest country in the world and everything was all right.

We saw homelessness grow in every city in America, drug abuse increases unprecedented, an ozone hole in the atmosphere that some folks told us did not exist; while our President advocated Brilliant Pebbles—a Star Wars antimissile array orbiting in space.

Life in America, down on the streets, where ordinary people are, has deteriorated. Public schools have become more public than schools, with strangers walking on campuses and shooting teachers and students; schools are becoming merely an extension of the battleground and disarray that exists on every American urban street and in many American homes, urban, suburban, and rural.

And President Bush started a war in Iraq and spent thousands of lives and we still do not know what for.

We just recently lost the \$16.2 billion stimulus package because of Republican gridlock in the Senate. And on my jog the other day with the President, I asked him, Mr. President, why did you give up? Fight on for the stimulus package.

And he responded to me,

You know, Cynthia, I never expected that the people who would benefit from the jobs—the young people who would get summer jobs, the parents who would get immunizations for their babies, the students who would get Pell grants for college, the unemployed who would get jobs to repair the infrastructure, and the elected officials in cities and counties all over this country who would receive much-needed dollars for their communities—I never imagined that they wouldn't stand up and scream in outrage that this money and these opportunities were being taken away from them.

And what could I say to the President, because he was absolutely right.

The rallying cry of the Republicans was cut spending first. But they can find \$45 billion to clean up the S&L scandal; they can find billions of dollars for Russia, but they could not find \$16.2 billion for you, your mothers and fathers, your brothers and sisters, children, and the rest of us who have been hurting for the past 12 years.

The fight is not over, though, as we continue to try to defy gridlock and do what is right for our constituents and our country. There was no reason for the President and the American people to lose that \$16.2 billion. We lost by three votes. But it is done now. And as a result of an emboldened Republican minority promoting, at best, business-as-usual politics, and at worst, serve-the-rich policies, the Democratic agenda will have to be unfortunately compromised if we are to avoid gridlock.

We do have to pay the hand that we are dealt.

But every American has an opportunity to help us play our hand as best we can. I have heard from my constituents who say that they are willing to sacrifice a little more if it will help everyone—if all Americans will be made a little better off.

I would ask that each of you listening tonight make a commitment that you will help to make our country stronger. The need today is much more pressing than a lost stimulus package. The entire agenda for change is threatened if we don't act—today.

And so, I would say to my colleagues in the House and the Senate, and to our friends across this country: Let the message be loud and clear, that change is not a free good. We all want it, but only a few are willing to work for it.

I am asking that we now make a commitment to work for it.

Join with me and let us renew the faith of our mothers in our ability to be winners;

Join with me and let us renew the faith of young Goodwin, Cheney, and Schwerner in the American dream.

And let us renew a pledge to ourselves that we will not allow others to thwart that which is good and right and just for us. Let us renew our willingness to fight for what is right.

Otherwise, a new season of discontent is likely to unfold. One, I believe, that this country can avoid with our active prodding. Many who listen tonight are the lucky ones. Let us join together to forge opportunities for all who are willing to work hard and dream about what might yet be.

The President's budget represents our future. Let us take the charge and protect our country well. The people are counting on us.

□ 2110

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. I appreciate them very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to just raise some questions and see if I can have some understanding. Perhaps that would be helpful for others who may be wondering about if this bill indeed does represent cuts, real cuts.

I know I have a lot of people telling me that we ought to really cut first and spend later, and what they mean by that is tax later.

Could the gentleman just share with me if they are real cuts, particularly in agriculture.

Mr. OBEY. Well, let me simply respond by telling the gentlewoman what I have experienced in my office in the last 2 weeks.

□ 2120

I asked my staff last week to simply keep track of the number of groups in my district who came in to talk to me about opposing the spending cuts in the Clinton plan. I had 31 different groups, not lobbyists, but folks from home who came to me objecting to one kind of cut in the President's budget or another. We had some doctors objecting to the Medicare caps—doctors, hospitals. We had farmers concerned about the additional squeezing going to take place. There were all ranges of people, all well-meaning.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would say to those who are claiming that there are no spending cuts in this package that I wish they had been talking to those 31 groups from my district, all of whom were objecting strenuously to them and asking that I resist them. I think they have a quite different view.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Will the gentleman respond?

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield, I was going to present this a little later this evening,

but I do have a list of very specific cuts that are in the reconciliation bill if the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] would like me to articulate those.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Well, if I could get the gentleman to do that a moment later, I just wanted to emphasize that I know I received calls, as well, in agriculture. I live in a community where the concern was there if indeed others were going to suffer the same way they were suffering. So, it is called shared pain and obviously I was concerned, not only for my farmers, but also people who live in rural areas, and I know the whole Btu tax, that the farming community expressed concerns, and I certainly shared those concerns, and there was some accommodation made to—I thought in the Btu—for at least the fuel in farming; is that correct?

Mr. OBEY. Yes; the farm use has been exempted from the higher of the two rates which apply under the Btu tax. But there are other very large spending cuts in this package.

For instance, tomorrow morning I am supposed to chair a markup that marks up the foreign aid bill for this year. By the time we get done marking up that bill, there are going to be programs in the foreign aid package which are cut by 50 percent below last year. Since I have been chairman, Mr. Speaker, foreign aid has already declined by \$5 billion, and we are going to have to take it down another \$1 billion tomorrow just to meet the squeeze required under President Clinton's package.

And my phone has been ringing off the hook all day long from every single interest group in this country who has a stake in seeing that bill increased rather than decreased, so I wish they could have simply been—those who say there are no squeezes in this bill—I wish they could have been on the receiving end of those phone calls today that I received.

Mrs. CLAYTON. My final question and comment would be around the fairness of our effort to accommodate the response to the Btu taxes being negative to low income persons or families, and particularly as it relates to being an aggressive tax to those persons who make less than \$35,000. My understanding, or one of the responses to that, was the earned income.

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely.

Mrs. CLAYTON. And that meant that it was sensitive to families who made less than \$35,000.

Mr. OBEY. Absolutely. You have the earned income tax credit, which is in the President's package, and, as a result of that, as a result of that, the Btu tax will actually—even with the Btu tax this package will result in a—about a \$10 a month tax cut for persons making below \$10,000, for instance, and it will not amount to a heavy hit until you get up to those who make over a hundred thousand dollars.

So, it seems to me we have one of two choices on that tax. We can either do as has been done the last 12 years, telling everybody, "Oh, don't worry. If there's any pain at all, we'll get rid of it for you." Or we can honestly belly up to the bar and say, "Folks, it is going to be a small impact on you, but it is well worth it to create a better world for your kids," and that is what we are trying to do.

This chart demonstrates that for low income groups, with the Btu tax included, there will still be a decline in the average monthly tax rate of anybody making less than \$35,000 a year.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would yield on this question of the earned income credit, it has been my understanding through the years that the reason we wanted to increase the earned income credit was to make it possible to induce people to stay off welfare and to continue to work.

It is also my understanding that the increase that is in this reconciliation bill is the largest increase we have ever had in the earned income credit so that it would have the opportunity, the program, of pulling more and more people out of welfare, getting them to take a job and to be willing to keep the job because their taxes would be reduced, and they would be induced to stay off of welfare and in productive income.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would recall when the President spoke to us in that magnificent State of the Union Message that he delivered in this very Chamber, one of the statements he made that got the largest round of applause was when he said that under his proposal no one who worked full time would go home at night still in poverty. It was his belief that through devices such as the earned income tax credit we would be able to say to each and every American who works full time for a living that, if they are willing to work that hard, they will not be home each night to face their kids in the state of poverty.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I just wanted to make that point.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, that is a good point, and also another point that I think the gentleman would share is that this has bipartisan support, the earned income, and there are those who would want to say this is all of a sudden gimmickry to just help the poor from this administration.

Mr. OBEY. I would say one of the champions of the earned income tax credit is the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. PETRI]. He is from my own State, a Republican who championed that cause for years.

Mrs. CLAYTON. And it does reinforce the value of work, it reinforces the value of families, it reinforces the value of supporting dependent children, and it gives opportunity, even with this tax, to offset that burden. So, I

think the fairness of that tax has to be also emphasized.

No one likes taxes, but the case is being made by others who would want to distort what the complications are that this would have a disproportionately harmful effect on low income families or working families when in fact it is only a large income for those above \$35,000, and there are provisions within the law to offset the burden on poor working families with children.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank them both. I would simply like to close by making this observation:

This chart demonstrates that our debt, the national debt of this country, declined steadily from 1945 as a percentage of our national annual income. Down to about 1973 but national debt was almost 120 percent of our annual national income. At the end of World War II it declined to about 24 percent of our national annual income by 1973, stalled out until 1980, and since the Reagan budgets were first adopted has now gone up again, just about doubling as a share of our total national income over that time.

The President's package is an effort to try and finally reverse that. This chart demonstrates the difference between the trend lines on the Federal deficit which will continue to go up if we do not adopt the Clinton plan versus the reduction in the deficit that will occur if we do adopt the Clinton plan. For those of my colleagues who say that is not good enough, I would simply say, "You had your try at it. This chart represents what the result was. You told us in 1981 that, if we passed the Reagan package, you would take us from a deficit of \$55 billion at that time down to zero. Instead you gave us deficits of \$200 billion."

□ 2130

You said you would do it better when you produced Gramm-Rudman, and Gramm-Rudman II, and each time promise did not match performance and in fact we had larger deficits than when the process began.

It is time for those who gave us three magic fixes in a row to now step aside and let the President have a chance to adopt his plan. It is the only one in town that has a real change to reduce the deficit, to restore economic growth, to restore family income growth in this country. After 12 years of trying their failed prescriptions, it seems to be we are entitled to give the President a chance to try this.

ADDITIONAL TAXES WILL DAMAGE THE ECONOMY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Democrat majority talking about the plan that is put forth by President Clinton and has been worked over by the Democrat leadership and now will be before the full House shortly and be before all of our colleagues to analyze and vote on. Let me just state a couple of things that I think the Democrat majority is missing.

The first thing that they are missing is that taxes change behavior. Each time we are presented with new taxes, they are presented as an automatic reducer of deficits. If you have somebody who is working in the 30 percent tax bracket, you boost him up to 33 percent, and that is automatically going to raise that proportionate amount of income relative to the 3 or 4 percent tax increase. And if you have a Btu tax that is applied to all of American enterprise across the spectrum of industry, that is going to raise a certain amount of tax money absolutely with no reductions or no mitigation of that tax, that effective tax, due to loss of enterprise and due to loss of industries.

In fact, taxes do affect behavior. They affect the behavior of the American people. Very simply, if you have a small businessman and you increase the taxes on him, whether it is through a Btu tax, an energy tax, an 8-cent-per-gallon-at-the-pump tax if he is a trucker, or any of a number of other ways through the manufacturing process with this energy tax that the President has proposed, if you take dollars out of his pocket and give them to the Government, then those are dollars that that small businessman or large businessman is not going to use to buy new equipment, expand his facility, and hire people.

The second basic truth that I think has been missed by the Democrat majority is this: To have jobs, to have employees, you have to have employers. The gentleman who has presented the charts here and the Democrat leadership that has talked about what they consider to be the benign or benevolent effect of these increased taxes have missed the fact that you need to have people who are making enough money to want to take a risk, to go out and build factories, to invest in new equipment, and to hire people. Blue collar workers cannot hire each other.

Yet each time I hear the majority talk about tax increases, they talk about wealthier people. I thought this point was an important one. It was made by my friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY]. He pointed out that yes, people at the wealthier end of the spectrum did pay more money during the Reagan years in total taxes paid, but he said they made a lot more money.

I think the problem with the Democrat leadership's thinking is they look at people, many of these people in

these \$200,000 tax brackets who are small businessmen, who employ people, who have payrolls, they look at those people as the adversaries, as people who damage the economy if they make a profit, as people who if they did not make a profit somehow the money they generate would go to other people. And that is just not the case.

If a person goes out and takes out a loan and builds a tract of homes, then that money is used to employ people, it is used for mortgage payments by the workers, it is used to buy cars and to send kids to college. It is turned over in the American system. It creates a ripple effect. And you lose that effect, you lose that growth effect, if you damage the economy by putting onerous taxes on employers. So employees do require employers.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND THE AGRICULTURE COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include therein extraneous material on this special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Committee on Agriculture have taken this special order to discuss the very crucial vote we have before us Thursday with regard to President Clinton's budget.

Mr. Speaker, in making my comments on my special order and inviting the comments of my colleagues who serve on the Committee on Agriculture, I do so with all due respect to the comment that the majority leader and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], and the chairman of the Committee on the Budget [Mr. SABO]. I would suggest, however, that rather than go into a lengthy dissertation on what has happened in the eighties and a very unique version of the class warfare argument that has been raised in this body time and time again, that this debate is not with 176 Republicans that are not going to vote for higher taxes. Your debate is with the 60 or so Democrats who do not want to vote for this, and for very good reason.

We have, as I recall, about 256 or 257 Democrats and 176 Republicans, and the real situation here is that we have an honest difference of opinion. We can get into that in terms of that debate. But the debate is over all of the Democrats who want to vote for this. Why? It is because it is a vote that will di-

rectly affect the pocketbooks and the daily lives of every American, but especially the economic well-being of farm families whose job it is to feed this country and a very troubled and very hungry world.

Simply put, this tax heavy budget represents a blueprint for disaster in farm country. Those are harsh words, I intend them to be, and I certainly do not intend my concern and criticism to be in a partisan manner. But every Member of this body has an obligation to study and fully understand the practical effect of what will happen as a result of our actions when we consider legislation, and we have an obligation of informing as best we can the people we represent of the consequences of what is passed by this body.

Every member on the Republican side of the Committee on Agriculture wants to work with the President and my colleagues across the aisle in regard to reducing the deficit and certainly reviving our country. We all share that goal. But as we pencil out the Clinton plan and determine the effect on farmers and ranchers in rural America, and, more important, as farmers and ranchers really pencil this out on the details, the conclusion is obvious: The White House budget posse is riding in the wrong direction.

Let us look at the facts. Farmers and ranchers are true patriots. They know the deficit is the No. 1 problem facing our Nation and they have done their part.

I am quoting the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], when I say of the top 12 entitlement programs, only farm program spending has declined since 1985.

□ 2140

In fact, farm programs spending has been cut an average of 9 percent in the last 4 years. This budget, this farm program budget, cuts farm spending by 11 percent. It goes without saying, if every other program had shared the same sacrifice, our deficit problems would not be so severe.

Nevertheless, the Clinton budget cuts almost \$3 billion in direct farm income over the next 5 years. Let me emphasize again, this \$3 billion cut is an addition to \$57 billion in cuts agriculture has made over the past 10 years.

Now, it would be one thing if by taking the \$3 billion in deficiency payments out of farmers' pockets represented a fair share sacrifice. We have heard a lot about fair share sacrifice on the other side of the aisle.

Certainly, in reducing the deficit, as true deficit patriots our farmers and ranchers would say, "All right, find the \$3 billion in savings and let us get the job done."

But, Mr. Speaker, that is not the case. The Clinton budget plan spends an additional \$7.3 billion on food

stamps above and beyond the cost of living adjustment. Nobody is trying to cut food stamps, and why are we doing that? Because the President's Btu tax falls heaviest, despite the charts and the arguments, falls heaviest on the poorest of Americans.

So the farmers' \$3 billion sacrifice is not going to the deficit. It is going to fund additional food stamps due to the Btu tax that the farmer does not want to pay in the first place.

The result is that agriculture's part of the Clinton budget adds \$4.4 billion to the deficit. And what about the Btu tax? The individual impact from the tax will vary, according to region and size of the farmer's operation and his crop. But farmers can expect an additional \$1,000 to \$4,000 a year in costs each year because of the Btu tax.

To offset this revenue loss from granting this minor relief to farmers, the much acclaimed exemption of ethanol from the Btu tax was eliminated. Now, the absurd nature of the Btu tax is illustrated by the convoluted budget structure of this proposal.

Here is what all of this really boils down to, folks. The Btu tax is expected to bring in \$70.5 billion over 5 years. That is the linchpin of the Clinton plan. However, in order to offset the burden of this energy tax on the poor, spending was increased in several Federal programs: \$7.3 billion in food stamps; \$28.3 billion for an earned income tax credit, as referred to by the majority leader; \$4 billion for low income energy assistance.

So here we have the Government, which will have to spend nearly \$40 billion to offset the harm done by the \$70 billion in new taxes, while imposing an unfair and unequal burden on energy-intensive industries like agriculture.

I will say again that farmers are willing to contribute to deficit reduction. They repeatedly have done so over the past decade. But it is fundamentally unfair to ask them to make another major sacrifice for a plan that will raise \$3.23 in taxes for every dollar cut in spending, with a net result, after 5 years, of economic pain, very little progress on the deficit.

Nor is it fair that their programs be cut to the bone while the administration and Congress insist on major spending increases for favorite programs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to a valuable member of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from Kansas, our fearless leader on the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. Speaker, tonight's debate, for me, is really the whole reason why I ran for Congress. The whole reason I got into this crazy business in the first place is because I recognized what the deficit and the national debt was doing

to our kids, and, maybe selfishly, doing to my kids.

In fact, when my son Mark was born, there was a bill in his crib, because of the deficit and debt in this country, of \$15,000.

You might think, well, my son is what, paying more than his fair share. No; every person in this country has that kind of bill sitting at their table right now to pay as a result of our problems.

So what do we do? What do we do?

We hear about cutting. We hear about fair share. Well, fair share has definitely been provided by farmers. In fact, over the past decade, as my colleague for Kansas indicated, farmers have contributed \$57 billion to deficit reduction, \$57 billion.

Are we complaining? No. Maybe a little bit, only because we feel that maybe some other sectors have not contributed as much. But we will take that, and we will even up the ante.

Farmers have told me we will contribute more in deficit reduction through more spending cuts. So the Committee on Agriculture this year was asked to make a few cuts. We did. We cut \$12.9 billion out of farm programs for farmers in the Committee on Agriculture. We went along with it only because we knew we had to provide our fair share, but only until we found out what that savings was going for.

You know what it was going for? The same thing farmers across the country complain about all the time, the fact that we use farm program reductions for food stamp increases; \$7.3 billion was increased in this agriculture budget because of the effect of, get this, the Btu tax.

You might ask, what is going on here? The Clinton administration believes that because of the effects of the Btu tax that they are going to have to increase food stamps \$7.9 billion just to make up the difference.

The Committee on Agriculture cannot stand for that. Republicans stand firm on the fact that those cuts should not go, if we are going to cut in agriculture programs. It needs to go to deficit reduction and not toward food stamp programs, when there has been no reform of the program, no revitalization, no streamlining, no efficiencies.

That is promised down the line, just like everything else has been promised in this country, but nothing was done today.

The Btu tax is supposed to bring in \$70 billion over the next 5 years. But in order to offset that, we have increased welfare programs \$40 billion, because we expect because of the Btu tax more and more people to be dependent on welfare, forced into that dependency.

We heard just a moment ago the majority leader indicate that "Aren't we special, we are increasing the earned income tax credit."

Why? Somebody needs to ask him that, because the Btu tax is driving people into poverty. The farmer must take the risk. The farmer must grow the food. The farmer must transport the food.

Then he has got to finance the food. Then he has got to market the food. Then he has to sell the food. And now we are telling farmers, "Stand in line in order to earn food stamps so you can buy back your food." And that is ridiculous in this kind of economy.

What are we telling the young farmers out there? We are telling them, "Don't come back to the farm. Don't come back to the farm. We don't need you. We don't need you."

Just make farmers get bigger. Get bigger, spend more money. That is what we are encouraging them to do.

None of those young farmers that Iowa has lost or any other district in this country are going to come running back to the farm in order to grow food under this kind of a plan. That is ridiculous. That is not economic growth and revitalization.

Clinton talked about patriots in his State of the Union Address. He talked about all Americans being patriots.

Farmers are patriots. They are not patriots, and we cannot stand for a Btu tax that is offset by welfare programs to drive farmers into welfare so that they can, in fact, be eligible for those same programs.

In a recent Tax Foundation study that just came out today, Iowa alone, because of the effect of the Btu tax, according to this independent foundation, is going to lose 4,779 jobs. That is economic growth, folks.

In fact, my district alone, if this Btu tax passes, is going to lose 890 jobs, in just my district.

Is that economic growth? Ask yourself who of you out there is willing to give up your job for this Btu tax. There are a lot of Congressmen, I think, who are probably going to lose their job over this.

□ 2150

Let me tell you this about the State of the Union Address. The State of the Union Address for me was exciting, because I felt as a newcomer to Congress that we had a President that was willing to stand up to the plate and deal with the budget deficit. You know what happened? When he went out to sell this plan to people, not the Republicans but the people, they said, "Cut spending first." What did he do? He abandoned his sales pitch.

Now what happens? We have Democrats by the droves running to the floor of the House to save the President's plan when he himself is not selling, when he himself is not out advertising, when he himself is letting Democrats fall on the sword.

People ask me, "Gridlock in Congress, Jim, how do you get around

gridlock in Congress?" Folks, gridlock is over. Gridlock is over on this side. We cannot stand in the way of their plan. How many do they have? They have more than 218, don't they? If they don't, maybe the gridlock is on their side of the aisle, and maybe they have to face up to that fact, not on the Republican side.

Of course, we are not going to vote for it. Are you crazy? We are not going to drive people out of work. But if you want to, you provide the votes. You pass the President's plan. He is not calling Republicans. He has not called me. He has not asked me to support the plan. He has not asked me how it affects farmers in Iowa.

They say, "Be specific." We have got Kasich. We even have two amendments that we are willing to introduce this week, if they will let us. Will they let us have an open rule? People out there watching, they say, "What is an open rule? That doesn't make any sense. That is procedural." An open rule means we get to debate this. We get to offer our amendments and we get to offer our specifics. We will see if they let us. Put your money where your mouth is, so to speak.

I think what we have to do is face up to the reality of what this plan is really going to mean. I think it is probably put best in the words of President Clinton's barber. President Clinton's barber probably would say, "Clinton is hair today and gone tomorrow."

Mr. Speaker, what is most disturbing about the past 4 months is that the way of doing business in the House of Representatives has not changed. My constituents tell me they are willing to sacrifice to reduce the Federal budget deficit. They have said repeatedly they are willing to step up to the plate and take their fair share of the hits to fight the red ink spending in Washington.

But that's not what has happened.

First, rural America took its share of hits when agricultural programs were cut \$2.9 billion.

But the hits didn't end there.

They were also informed that in addition to \$2.9 billion in cuts for agriculture, they would get hit with a Btu tax that will cost farmers between \$1,000 and \$4,000 per year. And they will get hit again with a barge tax that is expected to increase the cost of each bushel of corn between 5 and 10 cents.

But the hits don't just end there either. The money resulting from the cuts in farm programs and increased taxes will not go to the \$4 trillion debt hanging over our heads. Instead, Congress has decided that any savings resulting from farm program cuts and tax increases will go to fund new Federal programs.

Mr. Speaker, after the House of Representatives votes on the budget reconciliation package this week and the dust settles, it is rural America that will carry the burden of increased taxes. Rural America no doubt knows what it means to tighten their belts and is willing to sacrifice. But we have to cut spending first.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the way of doing business hasn't changed at all here.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DOOLITTLE], a valuable member of the Committee on Agriculture.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I enjoyed listening to the gentleman from Wisconsin and the majority leader make their version of history for all of us to understand. But try as they might to trash the 1980's, the fact of the matter is every income group improved. If we could only get back to the 1980's instead of the malaise of the 1990's.

Is it just Democrats that bear the burden of this? No. Democrats ruled the Congress, but we had Republican Presidents. We had disastrous plans for the 1980's to fix the budget, so we all had, Republicans and Democrats, our fingers in it together. We don't make any claim to the contrary.

This plan advocated by President Clinton is more of the same old warmed-over dinner. It did not work in the 1980's and it will not work in the 1990's.

Focus for a minute, if you will, on what the formula has been. It is always a promised immediate tax hike followed by a promised future set of spending reductions. When was this formula tried? We began in 1982 with the first disastrous tax hike, up until that point the biggest in history. TEFRA it was called. In 1984 we had DEFRA. In 1987 we had another effort; in 1989, yet another; in 1990, the disastrous budget summit agreement that cost George Bush his Presidency.

Now the Democrats, led by President Clinton, come into this Chamber and before the United States ask us once again to put blinders on and pretend the emperor is wearing a magnificent suit of clothes. In reality, it is just the same old failed nonsense. We get immediate promised tax hikes, now the largest in history, and promised future spending reductions.

Of course, it turns out, when you read the fine print, that even in this plan we discover there will be no net spending reductions for the first 2 years of the plan. Mr. Speaker, we will never get beyond the first 2 years of the plan. That is the idea. Don't you think it is fascinating, we have a 5-year plan and we get the first couple of years and then we are onto a new 5-year plan, with yet more tax increases and further spending reductions? Look at this chart. These numbers have changed a little bit, I am going to be very honest. This is a moving target, and this chart was prepared a month ago, so they are a little different.

Let me just outline briefly what the effect of the Clinton plan is. It is \$140 billion in new spending, under these numbers, \$359 billion in new taxes, and, after we go through all of that, what do we end up with? After we penalize farmers and blue-collar workers and middle-class workers and everybody in

this country, shared sacrifice, it is like socialism, equal sharing of misery, as Churchill said, what do we end up with? We end up with an annual budget deficit of \$228.5 billion.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER], the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means, tells me this is now projected to be \$250 billion, but it is over \$200 billion, wherever the numbers may fall.

What does that do for us? It is a serious fiscal risk for this country to end up after the largest tax increase in history and energy tax that is going to cost 600,000 jobs, and the effect of the other taxes in the Clinton plan may be to cost 1½ to 2 million jobs, and then we end up with an enormous annual deficit.

Let me show the Members by comparison what has happened in the past. This chart is not upside down. It just so happens that the Government has not had a very good record with its budget in past years. Look, this goes clear back to 1940. These are inflation-adjusted dollars. Look at what happened here in World War II. In inflation-adjusted dollars we had annual budget deficits of over \$500 billion. But look here, near the end of World War II, the tremendous drop that occurred, down to about \$180 billion. Guess what, folks? The next year there was a surplus, a surplus that is about \$45 billion.

Under this pathetic administration plan, after huge tax increases, we will end up with an annual budget deficit of over \$200 billion after 5 years, and having added a cumulative total to our existing national debt, which is about \$4 trillion now, it will be \$5 trillion.

That will not work. It will not work for farmers, it will not work for housewives, it will not work for children, it will not work for senior citizens, it will not work for anyone who hopes to thrive in this Republic.

A good Democrat, John F. Kennedy, used to say, "A rising tide lifts all boats." Another way of saying that is, when the rich get richer, the poor get richer. Sure, we can go back into socialism and have the equal sharing of misery, kind of like we got a taste of that right now. It is going to get worse if we enact the Clinton plan.

We have had various statements about farmers. Let me quote from the president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, writing to President Clinton. He said:

I am compelled to express our members' deep concern about the energy tax proposal and your proposed economic package. If imposed, this tax will stifle economic output, increase production costs for farmers, cause farm prices to decline, and jeopardize our ability to compete in the world markets.

Agricultural products are processed, packaged, and transported to consumers. They will be more costly due to the multiplier effect of energy cost increases at each point in the food distribution chain.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to get real and recognize the key to balancing this

budget freeze. It is a reduction in spending. When I hear about how many billions that are being cut, that is only inside the beltway. They are not cutting anything, as far as I can tell. They are merely reductions below the planned increases, but they are net increases. It is a disaster. We have got to quit talking like that.

If you are going to talk about a cut, tell me that you are spending less next year than you are spending this year. That is a cut. That is the type of approach we are going to have to take, or at least a freeze so we allow the growth in the economy to reduce the deficit.

Paul Craig Roberts wrote an article saying that if President Reagan had continued the partial freeze in spending in 1987 for 2 more years, his administration would not have been known for its deficits. What we need to do is recognize there is an economic emergency in this country, and that does not mean you go out and pour money out the door from the Federal Government and not be subject to the phoney 1990 budget rules, the pay-as-you-go rules, like we have done time and time again. What it means is you stop spending and you let the budget gap close to the natural growth in the budget. That is the formula for success, and that is what will help farmers and everyone else.

□ 2200

So in this Agriculture Committee, and in this presentation, I thank the ranking member for the chance to address the House on these important issues. We have got to recognize that control of spending is what is lacking here. We do not need any tax increases of any kind. We need spending cuts, and this Clinton package does not do the job.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for his contribution.

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY], a most valuable member of the House Agriculture Committee.

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I am from Pine Bluff, AR. It is a little town in the Fourth Congressional District. There we have agriculture as a main commodity or main business and a staunch part of our economy. There we are playing out a game called farmers lose, and this farmers lose game comes from the fact that this reconciliation package that we are going to consider here soon in this body will hurt the farmers in two ways. It will cut the farm programs and cut the financial footings out from under the farmers, and it will also tax him or her in a disproportionate way as compared to other industries.

My colleagues have spoken to the inequity of raising food stamp spending. They have spoken on the hardships

that will be caused by the proposed Btu tax.

I want to spend some time talking about the other tax that will have a very negative impact on our farmers. That is the inland waterways fuel tax—the so-called barge fuel tax.

To add insult to injury, the reconciliation bill also adds another tax that will be devastating to thousands of farmers: The inland waterways fuel tax.

Forty percent of all grain shipped in this country moves by barge. The Ways and Means Committee announced that it had made a major concession to barge users by cutting the proposed increase in the inland waterways fuel tax in half.

This might sound good. But what it really means is that there will be a 250-percent increase in the tax on barge fuel, if this reconciliation package is passed.

The American waterways operators have said that the Ways and Means compromise is not enough. That organization says that jobs are already being lost in the industry, as orders for new vessels and equipment are canceled in anticipation of loss of business it will cause.

We have seen this already in the luxury tax that was passed here in this body. In the first year that luxury tax was passed there were 9,100 jobs lost and the Federal Government ended up paying out \$2.40 in benefits for every \$1 collected under the new tax. This is the experience we can fall back on as we look at what the taxes are going to do to the farmer.

We must not make the mistake of penalizing associated industries, like agriculture, with the full cost of all the various projects that may have been done on those rivers, for a wide variety of users and purposes.

I have tried hard to find out why this inland waterways tax has been proposed, and the only thing I hear is that the users should pay for the maintenance. But I know as a young boy growing up in Pine Bluff, AR, when that river was nothing but a thread in the summer and a raging torrent in the winter, lives were lost and land was devastated. This Arkansas River project, as well as other inland projects, were actually put in to have flood control, not so that we could have barge traffic. Barge traffic is a by-product of that, and to say now that we are paying for the maintenance for the barge traffic is wrong. It is not the reason why these particular inland waterways were created.

This tax has far-reaching and extraordinarily serious implications for a number of significant Federal policy areas. As an example, more than one-half of all U.S. export grain goes by barge to deepwater port, where prices paid are set by world market forces. Those forces are irrelevant to domestic

transportation costs, and farmers will have to absorb 85 to 95 percent of the rate increase as less income per bushel.

Using Army Corps of Engineers estimates, one study projects that farmers will contribute more than one fourth of all new revenue derived from the tax increase. The resulting farm income losses easily could trigger increased requirements for Federal support payments, offsetting much or possibly all new revenue derived from the Waterways fuel tax.

The Arkansas Farm Bureau, an organization I respect, is on record as being opposed to the barge fuel tax. They have indicated their great concern that it will not only hurt our farmers, but that it has hidden costs as well.

The Arkansas State Senate passed a resolution opposing the proposal to increase the inland waterways fuel tax, saying the tax would be "detrimental to the economy of Arkansas and the United States, resulting in lost jobs, lost public and private investments, and higher prices for all."

A lot of those people signing that particular resolution in the Arkansas State Senate are the closest of friends and the staunchest of supporters of our President.

The Arkansas Waterways Commission points out that barge transportation is the most environmentally friendly mode of transportation. A fuel tax in Arkansas, as in many other States, would create a railroad monopoly within the Nation for the movement of raw materials, farm crops, farm chemicals, and fuels. There is no economic logic for the destruction of the navigation industry.

The barge tax will have a ruinous effect on Arkansas agriculture, as well as on other Arkansas businesses. It will impact local communities, as farmers and other businessmen have to pay higher prices to get their goods to market. We should not even think about doing something that has such far-reaching effects, unless we know what those effects are and are willing to live with them.

Farmers cannot pass those costs along. Farm commodities are traded in international markets. The proposed reconciliation package will put American farmers at another disadvantage relative to their heavily subsidized competitors in other countries.

I joined my Republican colleagues in the Ag Committee in voting against the reconciliation package. Yet our voice in support of American agriculture went unheeded.

Farmers, who represent less than 2 percent of the population, are being asked to bear 10 percent of the discretionary, nondefense cuts.

As a result of this reconciliation package, we are faced with more taxes, more spending, higher deficits, and lower farm programs. Our Nation's farmers are being asked to suffer. And

this is not right. This is not proportionate.

This reconciliation package will be a terrible burden on an industry that is vital to the welfare of our Nation. We must not allow this burden to be placed on agriculture.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. CRAPO].

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for yielding and I rise this evening to support my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who oppose the increased energy tax proposed by the administration, and to help focus attention of this Nation on the heavy burden it places on rural and agricultural communities.

My home State of Idaho is powered by energy-intensive industries like agriculture, logging, mining, manufacturing, recreation, and tourism. This increased tax singles out rural and energy-dependent areas like the Second Congressional District in Idaho.

This proposed energy tax increase adds up to thousands of dollars in expenses for Idaho farmers. The men and women who work hard every day to grow food we put on our tables will bear an unfair burden under this tax.

Tax hikes on fuel, gasoline, and electricity alone will add millions to the cost of goods and services. It will boost the price of the very items that the farmers need to do business, fertilizer, equipment, transportation.

In my hometown region of Idaho Falls in eastern Idaho, potato and grain farmers will face an increase in production costs of several thousand dollars a year just for direct increases. That does not include the indirect increases that they will face in terms of increased fertilizer, electric, and transportation costs. Sugar, corn, mint, and wheat farmers in the Treasure Valley in southern Idaho will also face increased costs of thousands of dollars.

These are family farms, the ones that provide the backbone of our farm economy. We cannot ask them to foot this bill. I will not ask them to foot this bill.

The increased tax on agribusiness will have a ripple effect throughout rural economies. The Idaho Farm Bureau tells me that Idahoans will pay an additional \$160 million annually in direct energy taxes in utility and fuel costs. This tax takes the biggest bite from rural economies and will only drive farmers and other industries out of business. It will drive up the cost of food, and in the end will not help to reduce the deficit. This is the cruelest tax of all, a heavy middle-income tax.

We are asked by the President to pay this price to share the sacrifice in order to get this country out of its Federal deficit. But this tax increase will not be used to cut the deficit. History has shown and the review we just

saw earlier shows that every time we raise taxes in this country, spending increases more than the tax dollars increase. This last tax increase resulted in, I think it was, \$1.59 of increased spending for every \$1 of increased taxes. History should teach us this lesson, and we should not be lead down this path again.

Hundreds of Idahoans have sent me letters asking that Congress cut spending first. That is where our attention should be focused, in finding ways to cut spending, not to increase it.

The problem with our Federal Government is not that it taxes us too little but that it spends too much, and an increase in energy taxes will only continue that unfortunate trend.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING], a most valuable member of the House Agriculture Committee.

□ 2210

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I appreciate his organizing this special order on the eve, or the night before the eve, of the important tax vote in this House.

The American people have every right to know what is happening in their House. The Clinton budget hits farmers very hard. The American farmer is willing to do their share.

But let us look at it very closely: a \$3 billion decrease in farm programs, \$7 billion increase in food stamps. To the American public, it appears that agriculture has got a \$4 billion profit when, in fact, \$3 billion is taken out of the programs that make American agriculture competitive, that allow American farmers to stay in business while competing against the European Economic Community and other areas of the world in which we trade who are heavily subsidized.

Tonight I want to talk particularly about two elements of the Clinton plan which I think will hurt farmers.

No. 1, I want to talk about including ethanol in the Btu tax, and I want to talk briefly about the barge tax.

Originally, President Clinton included ethanol in his proposal to be taxed under the Btu tax. Ethanol was then exempted in a revised program which was intended to win farm support. However, the Committee on Ways and Means, in their wisdom, reinstated the tax on ethanol to pay for, listen to this, a partial exemption from the Btu tax for on-farm use of gasoline and diesel. So we put the tax on ethanol, we take the tax off ethanol, we put it back on, and we are going to give a little crumb to the farm community on the diesel they use on the farm.

We now probably will have to color that purple so that we can keep track of it. It may be a full-employment bill for inspectors to be sure you have pur-

ple-colored diesel fuel which is partially exempt from the Btu tax. Farmers are not going to be happy to hear that they lost one exemption just to pay for a partial exemption on other fuel they need, nor will they be happy to know that they are going to lose one of the fastest growing markets for their corn, the ethanol industry, nor, I think, are the working men and women of America going to be happy when they realize they are not going to have these jobs.

We are not going to have this renewable fuel made from American grown corn by American workers. Ethanol is that renewable fuel just like wind and other renewable sources and should be exempt.

Additionally, we have the barge tax then. It hits Illinois and other midwestern farmers very hard. We depend on the waterways to get our grain to market.

While Ways and Means cut Clinton's proposed barge tax in half, it still is over a 250-percent increase from the current tax. Congressional Research Service estimates that the original barge tax proposal would cost corn farmers in Illinois 6 cents a bushel. The Ways and Means barge tax will still cost 3 cents a bushel, and when corn is at 2.20, that is not much of a bargain.

I might mention that the taxes included in the President's plan are indexed to inflation. What a cruel hoax, sneak in in the middle of the night and take it out with inflation every year, an increase in the taxes. The American public should know that.

The bottom line is taxing ethanol and the barge fuel is just a part of a package that could devastate American agriculture and rural America. We will be back here trying to fix this mess probably in a year or two.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON], who represents a most important agricultural district.

Mr. KINGSTON. I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a letter from a constituent that I received last week. It says:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN KINGSTON: I am furious. I have lived the life of a south Georgia farmer all my life and I am deeply concerned about President Clinton's plans to cut the farm programs of our great nation. Who does he think is going to raise the crops and produce the food for the recipients of food stamps to purchase after he puts these self-sufficient, hard-working farmers out of business? You cannot grow beans, potatoes and corn on a piece of paper called a food stamp! It takes a thriving, producing farm with plenty of acreage to produce healthy, marketable food products.

I, along with my friends, are furious, and we would like you to remind the President that he will only serve 4 years at the rate he is going.

And this, Mr. Speaker, is from a Democrat.

Why is she so mad? Myra Johns is mad because she, like many other middle-class in America, was promised a tax cut by the now President Clinton. Instead they got a series of tax increases, fees, and other spending increases on them, the most famous, the one that hurts the farmers worst, I think, which is the Btu tax.

Down on the farm back home, we say Btu stands for "Bill's Tax is Unfair." It is unfair because it hits people with a direct tax increase of about \$400 for the average Georgia farm, and then indirect tax increases of about \$600 per farm. Now, is indirect costs going to increase the cost of the goods and services that they buy, the transportation, the fertilizer, all of the products that they purchase for the farm for their production of food which is going to increase and then, of course, the taxes on the municipalities, the counties that they live in.

These governments will have to incur higher taxes, or higher costs, for utilities that they consume, and they are going to have to turn around and increase the millage rates on these farmers.

So it is a very substantial tax increase.

Now, I know that the President said, "Do not worry, we are bringing interest down." Well, I am glad to know we have got a President now who can control the interest. Why does he not go ahead and control the weather while he is at it and help these farmers out a little bit more? For him to say that he controls interest rates, Mr. Speaker, please.

Look at the action of the committee last week; we increased the fees and cut spending on farmers \$2.9 billion because we needed to reduce the deficit, and then we turned right around and increased food stamps \$7.4 billion on top of an \$8.4 billion or an \$8 billion COLA which was built in.

Since 1979, food stamps have tripled: \$7,300 in 1979 to \$21,000 this year. How many farmers have had their incomes triple since 1979? How many farmers are millionaires, since we are out to kill millionaires? How many of the farmers are these big, bad, wealthy people the President keeps screaming about?

If this tax increase is so good, why is it that the majority party does not want to wait until the break to vote for it? Are they afraid they might go home and folks might say, "Hey, this is a horrible tax, and you folks are out of your mind if you think we are going to continue to let you run the Government based on these tax increases."

Mr. Speaker, farmers in my district are not afraid to do their part. They have always stepped forward, but what we need to do is help farmers so that they can produce more food at cheaper prices. We need to give them a capital gains tax cut, an investment tax cred-

it, and less regulations. We do not need to bite the hand that feeds us.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this particular time I yield to my friend and colleague to the north, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT].

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, tonight we are here to highlight the adverse effects that the majority's budget reconciliation package will have on U.S. production agriculture.

This package will likely result in: the largest tax increase in history; pushing the economy back into recession; driving the deficit further out of control; dragging the country further into debt; and an even more powerful Federal bureaucracy. And to get all of this, we are once again asking the country's agriculture producers to ante up, and do more than their fair share.

Mr. Speaker, the President and many others have asked for shared sacrifice. This package sacrifices the farmer; there is not shared sacrifice involved. Farmers have shown their willingness to do their fair share, as agriculture has already sacrificed \$57 billion over the past decade—percentagewise, more than any other sector of the economy. I believe too much focus has been placed on agricultural spending, which accounts for less than 1 percent of our total Federal spending.

Nearly \$2 billion of the cuts in farm program spending will come from reducing the number of acres on which a farmer can receive deficiency payments, by 5 percent. This reduction comes on the heels of the 1990 budget reconciliation provision, that just 2 years ago stripped the farmers of 15 percent of their cropland benefits.

The budget reconciliation bill we are scheduled to consider on Thursday, calls for an additional 5-percent increase in the so-called unpaid flex or triple base acres, without a corresponding reduction in the regulatory burden associated with conservation compliance on those acres.

Specifically, I want to focus on an amendment I offered during the Agriculture Committee reconciliation mark-up, that would have saved an additional \$269 million, and at the same time reduced some of the paperwork burden that has been placed on farmers.

My amendment, patterned after H.R. 1587, which was introduced by Mr. ROBERTS, and S. 610 by Mr. KERREY in the Senate, would simply say that on a farmer's unpaid acres, the farmer will no longer be subject to the conservation compliance and wetlands protection requirements of current law.

This theory reinforces the concept, adopted by Congress in the 1985 farm bill, that when farmers receive farm program benefits, the taxpayer has the

right to demand certain conservation benefits. The reverse should also be true. When the public withdraws benefits from farmers, the public at that point, forfeits the right to tell the farmer how to farm.

If this House, insists on imposing on our agriculture producers, the 5-percent triple base expansion, then the least we could do is relieve them of a few Federal mandates and save the taxpayers money at the same time.

Mr. Speaker, as the unpaid acreage increases from 15 to 20 percent, more farmers will find the program lacking in sufficient benefits, compared to the cost of setting aside acreage and complying with Federal mandates. This will severely reduce the levels of farm program participation.

According to the Food and Agricultural Research Policy Institute at the University of Missouri, a 5-percent increase in flex acres will reduce payments almost dollar for dollar from net farm income. For example, the study projects corn farmers' returns will decline around \$3 per acre; wheat farmers' returns will fall by \$1 to \$1.50 per acre; and cotton and rice returns will drop by \$3 to \$5 per acre under this package.

How can we continue to ask for more and give less? This concept does not work in the business world, and it is not going to work through another Government program. This philosophy of reducing farm program spending, and increasing mandates, is putting agricultural policy on a collision course with disaster.

President Clinton, in his State of the Union address said, "We ought to be subsidizing the things that work, and discouraging the things that don't." Agriculture programs have earned the right to be counted among the things that work.

Agriculture programs have a successful track record; they are worth the investment. Returns to America include: The world's safest and lowest cost food and fiber supply for American consumers; a job for one out of six Americans; and a \$16 billion positive trade balance for the Nation's economy.

In conclusion, I am opposed to the agriculture section of budget reconciliation, because it will severely damage agriculture by increasing production costs, reducing commodity prices, and decreasing world competitiveness. All this on top of the painful budget savings that agriculture has absorbed over the past 8 years. I cannot and will not support this proposal.

□ 2220

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Agriculture and Hunger.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the Clinton administration's cut in farm programs, their increase in the energy tax, and their rising deficit. It amazes me that in a time when our constituents are willing to make the sacrifices necessary to being the budget under control, the Clinton administration manages to cut farm programs, raise taxes across the board on agriculture producers, and increase the deficit \$4.4 billion for food stamps.

I want to be clear that food stamps are necessary for many Americans and their families. However, it's just as true that the President has promised to enact welfare reform. Certainly, it makes sense to defer this new spending until it can be put in the context of a reform package. If we were to defer the new spending it would not take 1 dollar of benefits away from those who are currently eligible, nor would it prevent those who are newly eligible from receiving food stamps. What this would ensure is that we are wisely spending taxpayer dollars.

But instead I have to go back to Colorado and tell the farmers in my district that we cut their programs by almost \$3 billion but still increased spending by almost \$4½ billion. And by the way, on top of all this, there's still the Btu tax you are subject to, and that is tied to inflation so every year it will continue to rise.

Mr. Speaker, all the farmers in my district are going to be adversely affected by the actions we took in the Agriculture Committee last week. But let me give you an example for a farmer I have known since I was in the Colorado State Senate. His name is Dennis Hoshiko. He farms in Weld County, primarily onions, along with some wheat and pinto beans.

He, like most farmers, is ready and willing to make some sacrifices to help balance our budget. He is willing, along with the rest of America, to give a little for the common good. But instead of telling him that we made hard decisions on the deficit, I have to tell him that once again we're going to tax him so we can increase spending. I am tired of saying it, they are tired of hearing it, but it keeps happening—increased spending.

It is frustrating because all of us who were elected last November were given one clear mandate: cut the deficit. It didn't matter what region of the country you came from. It did not matter what State. It did not matter whether you came from a rural or urban area, the message was the same: decrease the deficit. It is going to be tough on some of our colleagues to go home and explain increased spending.

As you can probably guess I'm going to vote against this budget. But it is probably still going to pass the House. I hope that the Senate can modify this

to make it less castor oil and more sugar. Or to put it plainly I hope they can hold down taxes in this program and come up with less spending.

Mr. ROBERTS. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. GOODLATTE, a most valuable member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. GOODLATTE. I thank the gentleman, our distinguished leader on the Committee on Agriculture on our side, for yielding to me.

I appreciate the time to talk about this devastating economic plan that the President has proposed.

The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] correctly pointed out that people of this country want more than anything else a reduction of this deficit, and the American farmer is making a contribution, more than a contribution, a real commitment to that deficit reduction with this budget cut of nearly \$3 billion, 11 percent of the agriculture budget.

Mr. Speaker, it reminds me of the story of the difference between the contribution of a chicken and that of a pig to a ham and egg breakfast. The chicken makes a contribution, the pig makes a real commitment.

That is what the American farmer is doing here with this budget.

Then he turns around and looks and sees what the Agriculture Committee at the same time is asked by this administration to do, and I cannot support, increased food stamps in this country by \$7.3 billion.

□ 2230

Now, nobody is calling for cutting the Food Stamp Program, but the reason why this program is being called for, the reason why it is necessary is that the Btu tax is going to take so much money out of the pockets of hard-working, low-income people that they are going to have to turn around and give it back to them in the form of food stamp handouts.

Now, what does that say, Mr. Speaker, for welfare reform in this country, that we would deprive hundreds of thousands of people with jobs—the estimate is over 600,000 jobs nationwide, more than 10,000 in my State of Virginia, and turn around and increase the food stamp budget by 25 to 30 percent. It is simply wrong. It is the wrong approach. The Btu tax, many of my constituents now understand what Btu really stands for, big time unemployment.

We need to get cuts across the board, not just in agriculture, but in everything across the spectrum of the Federal budget and get serious about cutting spending, not increasing taxes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER], who serves on the Armed Services Committee and who represents the

fabulous Fifth District, which is a vital agricultural district, and I welcome the gentleman to this special order.

Mr. BUYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] for yielding to me. I compliment the gentleman on his leadership on the Agriculture Committee and on his leadership in this country for agriculture.

I come here because I represent a rural district in Indiana, all the parts of 20 counties. That is very small compared to the 60 counties of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS], but the people of Indiana are very similar to the people of Kansas and very similar to people all across rural America.

The Btu tax, or the energy tax on middle-class families, yes, it sets out to raise \$71 billion in revenue, but we do not need a new source of revenue.

The President still has not received the message from the American people, and that is to cut spending first, not to create new spending.

To add on this energy tax so we can raise \$7 billion for food stamps and \$28 billion to increase the earned income credit is just a redistribution of wealth theories of old.

It is estimated that in Indiana the Btu tax will cost my State not only tens of thousands of jobs but also the Nation will lose over 600,000 jobs.

What really boggles my mind, Mr. Speaker, was when the President came here to this Chamber and he proposed the Btu tax, he at that time had no idea what effect the Btu tax was going to have upon agriculture nor the American families, nor upon manufacturing. Only now are we calculating what that effect is going to be.

In Indiana, the Indiana Farm Bureau conducted a study that showed the impact of the Btu tax alone on corn, soybean, and wheat production is over \$12 million annually, just in my district alone. The impact of three counties, White, Jasper, and Benton Counties, over \$1 million each. These are very rural counties. We are taking this money out of rural districts for redistribution around America.

A local farmer from Rensselaer who farms 1,200 acres of corn, soybeans, and wheat, projects that the annual cost will be over \$1,600 from those three crops alone. That does not take into account the barge tax, dairy products, the tax effect on livestock, an increase of rural electric.

We heard discussions about the shared sacrifice. Those who live in rural America are very used to shared sacrifice because they have always done more with less. It is part of their heritage. It is part of their character and that is why we refer to those people who grow up in rural America as those who live in the heartland of America.

This Btu tax is flat-out wrong and we should have a separate vote on the tax coming up.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and all the Members of the House Agriculture Committee and others who have contributed to this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I include the minority views of Republicans on the Agriculture Committee in the RECORD at this point:

[Committee on Agriculture, U.S. House of Representatives]

MINORITY VIEWS, TITLE I OF THE OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993, MAY 21, 1993

(Prepared at the Direction of Ranking Minority Member Pat Roberts by the Minority Staff of the Committee on Agriculture)

The final reconciliation package passed by the Committee on Agriculture cuts \$2.95 billion from the USDA Budget that will protect farm income over the next five years. This contribution to deficit reduction is on top of the \$57 billion in cuts surrendered by agriculture over the past decade.

At the same time, following the President's budget blueprint, the Committee action increases spending on food stamps by \$7.3 billion over the same five-year period. This increase comes despite an OMB spending baseline that projects food stamp spending increasing from \$25 billion to \$28 billion by 1998. Baseline estimates include provision for cost of living increases and newly eligible recipients. If the \$7.3 billion increase was eliminated, not a single person now eligible or expected to become eligible would lose a single dollar in food stamp benefits. This is simply an expansion of the program, supposedly to offset the effect of the Btu tax.

The Committee, voting on party lines, defeated amendments to block the food stamp increase and to eliminate the need for cuts to farmers by offsetting them against food stamp increases.

Nearly \$2 billion of the farm program cuts comes from reducing the number of acres on which a farmer can receive deficiency payments by 5 percent beginning in 1994. This increase in the so-called "unpaid flex" acres would be added to the 15 percent unpaid acres instituted to make savings in 1990. In addition to the 20 percent unpaid flex, farmers will be required to set-aside acres from production to qualify for entry into the farm programs. In 1994, for example, corn will have a set-aside of 10 percent plus a further 20 percent of unsupported acres. For wheat there will be a 5 percent set-aside plus the 20 percent unpaid flex acres.

The cuts adopted by the Agriculture Committee will be crippling to a farm economy that is already suffering from weak grain and commodity prices, but the devastation of agriculture does not end there. Among the \$240 billion in net additional taxes contained in the reconciliation bill are two taxes that will destroy the economic base of thousands of farms: the increase in the inland waterways fuel tax and the BTU energy tax. Unfortunately, these issues are beyond the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

The Ways and Means Committee announced a major concession to barge users (40% of all grain moves by barge) by cutting the proposed increase in half. While this may sound like progress, it still means that there will be a 250% increase in the tax on barge fuel. This increase will subtract five cents from the bushel-price for a farmer who ships his grain down the Mississippi River. A medium-size corn farmer in Illinois who ships half his crop for export could expect to lose \$2,000 from the price of his corn.

The President's BTU tax is the really big hit on farmers, and again the House Ways and Means Committee claims to have given an "exemption" to agriculture. In fact, the "exemption" is only a slight reduction of an unfair and disproportionate tax. Energy is the basis of all production and is used to increase efficiencies and reduce manpower needs. Nowhere has this been more true than in agriculture, perhaps the most productive sector of our economy. The BTU tax will be levied on all the gasoline, diesel, natural gas and electrical energy used by farmers.

In the proposed BTU tax petroleum-based energy will be taxed at a higher penalty rate. The Ways and Means Committee amended the President's plan to allow farmers to pay gasoline and diesel BTU assessments at the lower non-petroleum rate for on-farm uses. How useful is this "exemption" for farmers? In the aggregate they will still pay \$600 million to \$1 billion annually in BTU taxes. Individual taxes will vary according to region, size and specific crop, but farmers can expect to pay from \$1,000 to \$4,000 each year in additional taxes attributable to the BTU tax. To offset the revenue loss from granting this minor relief to farmers the much acclaimed exemption of ethanol from the BTU tax was stricken, denying this farm-based fuel a greater opportunity to crack the vehicle fuels market.

The absurd nature of the BTU tax is illustrated by the convoluted budget structure of the proposal. The BTU tax is expected to bring in \$70.5 billion over five years. However, in order to offset the burden of this energy tax on the poor, spending was increased in several federal programs: \$7.3 billion in food stamps; \$28.3 billion for the Earned Income Tax Credit; and \$4 billion for low income energy assistance. As a result the government will have to spend nearly \$40 billion to offset the harm done by the \$70 billion in new taxes, while imposing an unfair and unequal burden on energy intensive industries like agriculture. First, Congress creates the BTU tax, then its effects are offset with major spending increases like food stamps; and then farmers are asked to pay for the increased food stamps by cutting their programs. Farmers get it coming and going.

Farmers have indicated their willingness to make contributions to reducing the deficit. Indeed, they have repeatedly done so over the last decade. But it is fundamentally unfair to ask them to make another major sacrifice for a plan that will raise \$3.23 in taxes for each \$1 cut in spending with the net result after 5 years of economic pain very little progress on the deficit. Nor is it fair that their programs be cut to the bone while the Clinton Administration and the Democrats insist on major increases in spending for their favored programs.

THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE HAS A RECORD IT CAN BE PROUD OF ON THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Over the past several years the Agriculture Committee has reported numerous bills, that were enacted into law, expanding the food stamp program and other nutrition programs under the Committee's jurisdiction. In the 100th Congress, there were 7 bills; in the 101st Congress, there were 4 bills, including the 1990 Farm Bill; and in the 102d Congress, there were 4 bills.

Since the inception of the food stamp program, with pilot projects in 1961, total food stamp spending has reached \$220 billion.

In 1983, ten years ago, food stamp spending totalled \$12.7 billion. In 1993, it is expected food stamp spending will total \$25 billion—double the federal funds spent on the pro-

gram. Since 1983, \$175 billion has been spent on the food stamp program.

The food stamp program is designed to automatically expand to meet the food needs of poor families—without any additional legislation. People with incomes below 130% of the poverty line are generally eligible for food benefits. Food stamp benefits are indexed each year to account for the cost of food inflation. Therefore increases in participation are accommodated within the current program.

In 1981 and 1982 the rate of growth of the food stamp program was slowed down. However, according to a study prepared by the Urban Institute in May 1986, the average number of food stamp participants, the average benefit, and the total program costs all showed growth from 1981 to 1984.

The study shows that the effects of the 1981-1982 food stamp legislation was smaller than original expectations and the basic structure of the food stamp program did not change significantly. The legislative changes did not have a consistent or significant effect on the number of people receiving food stamps.

The Urban Institute Policy and Research Report concluded "... on the whole, it appears that the legislation exercised moderate restraint on program growth and costs without undermining its ability to serve current and potential recipients."

The food stamp program is carefully designed to expand to meet the needs of poor families, without any legislative changes. Over the past ten years the food stamp program has been liberalized almost every year. It was significantly expanded by Congress in 1985 and 1988.

According to figures from the Department of Agriculture, the food stamp program will cost over \$28 billion by 1998—without any legislative changes to the program. With the changes adopted by the Committee, the food stamp program will cost \$30 billion by 1998, with no reform of the system and no opportunity to improve poor peoples' chances to get a job.

Food Stamp Program Growth (In billions)

Year:	Expenditure
1979	\$6.9
1980	9.2
1981	11.3
1982	11.1
1983	12.7
1984	12.5
1985	12.6
1986	12.5
1987	12.5
1988	13.3
1989	13.8
1990	16.5
1991	19.8
1992	23.5
1993	25.1

WHAT IS WELFARE REFORM

The goal of welfare reform is to make taxpayers out of able bodied participants, something that will be difficult to do with the present welfare system. In the long run reform of the welfare system will benefit participants and taxpayers. Nevertheless, reform can entail costs and spending more money now on the food stamp program, before we reform the system, is not the right thing to do.

Putting \$7.3 billion into the food stamp program before any reforms are made to the welfare system is like putting the cart before the horse. There is a better way to provide

help to poor families and the President's proposal to reform welfare as we know it presents an opportunity that should be seized.

WHERE IS THE REFORM OF THE WELFARE SYSTEM?

One of the themes of President Clinton's campaign and a bi-partisan goal of Congress is to end and reform welfare as we know it. Unfortunately, the food stamp proposals adopted by the Committee do not end welfare as we know it; rather, they continue the same welfare programs. In fact, they will trap second generation food stamp recipients in the circle of poverty that undermines family and self responsibility. The President said he wanted to require those who can work, to go to work. What is missing in the food stamp package adopted by the Committee is a significant proposal to accomplish this goal; to target assistance to the truly disadvantaged; and, to assist those who are able-bodied gain employment. In fact, the changes to the food stamp employment and training program included in the President's bill cost \$20 million over five years—or less than .3%—three tenths of one percent of the entire five year cost of the bill. If we are to increase food stamp spending by over \$7 billion, surely we can allocate more than .3% of employment and training programs.

Before additional funding is allocated to the food stamp program, described by the President as an investment, this "investment" should pay dividends—to the able bodied people now relying on food stamps, by ending this circle of poverty, and to the taxpayer who is footing the bill.

THE CASE FOR WELFARE REFORM OR ENDING THE "CIRCLE OF POVERTY"

Families participating in the food stamp program have needs other than food—the need for financial assistance, help in finding a job, housing, and medical assistance are among the major problems facing poor families. The present system with the lack of coordination and resolution of the differences among the programs, is very troublesome. There are major problems facing the entire public welfare system. Until these problems are addressed, which must include budgetary, regulatory, tax, and welfare reform, real assistance for needy families will not be achieved.

When a family is in need of help, that need often crosses program lines and the hurdles that families must scale in applying for help are immense. They often must go to different agencies, meet different eligibility standards, and abide by different rules and regulations. That they are able to receive help is a reflection of their abilities, rather than the system presented to them.

The time is ripe for change. There is great interest in looking at the present welfare system and making changes that benefit the families looking for help and the administrators running the programs. President Clinton, while campaigning and in his State of the Union address, made the point we must end welfare as we know it by giving poor families the tools necessary to improve their lives and those of their children. He is right. Unfortunately, the Agriculture Committee turned its back on this opportunity.

COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

The President's 1994 budget proposed to institute an energy tax, better known as a BTU tax. Because of the effects of this new tax the President also proposed to increase spending in programs designed to help poor families.

The Administration submitted its proposals for changes to the food stamp program to

increase spending on the food stamp program by \$563 million in 1994 and by \$6.955 billion over a five year period. The proposals include removing the ceiling on the excess shelter deduction which will cost \$2.5 billion over five years (over one-third of the new spending) resulting in additional food stamp benefits to only 15% of the families receiving food stamps. Another change increases the value of a car food stamp families may own and then increases that amount each year to reflect the changes in the consumer price index for new cars.

The Agriculture Committee adopted the Administration's food stamp proposals, with few changes, and the resulting expenditures total \$7.137 billion over five years. The Committee rejected two proposals: to offset cuts to farm programs and increase food stamp spending by \$4.4 billion and to defer additional food stamp spending until the President's welfare proposal is submitted to Congress.

The Committee rejected an opportunity to place \$7.3 billion in a "trust fund" for future reform of the welfare system. Instead the Committee chose to spend now and probably pay later as well.

THE ROBERTS AMENDMENT

The instructions from the Budget Committee to the Agriculture Committee required a cut in agriculture programs of \$2.9 billion over five years and an expansion of \$7.3 billion for the food stamp program. This means that the Agriculture Committee is charged with increasing the deficit by almost \$4.4 billion—\$7.3 billion minus \$2.9 billion—with none of the money going to agricultural programs.

Because of the 1994 Budget Reconciliation, the Agriculture Committee will be charged with cutting farm programs and contributing to the deficit at the same time. This action was required despite the fact that farm programs have been cut by \$57 billion since 1981.

The Roberts amendment simply said—no cuts to agriculture programs and increase the food stamp program by \$4.335 billion. The result would have been that the Committee would be spending an additional \$4.335 billion; but, agriculture programs would not be reduced. If this amendment had been adopted, the Committee would have been within its spending guidelines, and farmers would not have suffered another year of budget cuts.

The Roberts amendment did not cut food stamp program spending. It increased food stamp program spending over the baseline by almost \$4.4 billion over five years.

Nevertheless, the Committee chose to reject the Roberts amendment, on a straight party line vote, cut farm programs, and almost doubled this amendment's increase in food stamp spending. Farmers, who represent less than 2% of the population, are being asked to bear 10% of the discretionary, non-defense cuts.

THE EMERSON AMENDMENT

An amendment was offered in the Agriculture Committee by Congressman Emerson to strike the food stamp expansions included in the Committee's reconciliation package and include instructions to defer the \$7.3 billion in spending until the President submits his welfare reform proposal. The Committee rejected this proposal and chose to spend additional money on the food stamp program now without any attempt to reform the system.

THE BARRETT AMENDMENT

The Committee rejected an amendment offered by Congressman Barrett that would

save money and at the same time reduce some of the paperwork burden that has been placed on farmers since 1985. The Barrett Amendment reinforced the concept adopted by the Committee in the 1985 Farm Bill, that when farmers receive farm program benefits, the taxpayer has the right to demand certain conservation benefits. The converse should be true. When the public withdraws benefits from farmers, the public at that point forfeits the right to tell the farmer how to farm.

Mr. Barrett's amendment (HR 1587) would exempt from conservation compliance regulations that portion of the farmer's farm for which he or she is not receiving Federal Farm Program benefits.

Our current course, reducing farm program spending and ever increasing mandates is heading agricultural policy on a collision course. Economics will dictate that the farmer simply opt out of the farm programs and the entire farm will not have to be in conservation compliance. This would be a catastrophe for our nation's effort to protect the nation's soil and water resources.

The Barrett amendment would have at least provided a minimal regulatory relief and also save money. The Committee rejected the proposal with the intent of further examination of the issues raised by the amendment and we urge the Committee to proceed expeditiously in considering HR 1587.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ACT AMENDMENTS

Although an argument could be made that these amendments are an extension of the rural development title of the 1990 Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act, nonetheless, we believe the Committee has included in a budget package a dramatic policy shift in the delivery of USDA rural development programs. This reorganization of programs and activities may create a more efficient delivery system and a more coherent federal policy apparatus. It is a cause of concern, however, that it has been adopted outside the usual procedural restraints of committee hearings and deliberation. We believe the Administration and rural America should also be concerned over the sweeping changes made to a significant program critical to rural America, without hearings and public comment.

It should be pointed out these REAct amendments achieve only modest savings, about 20% of the savings required by the House Committee on the Budget. These "lost" savings must necessarily be taken from other program functions affecting farmers, ranchers and rural areas. While we believe the Committee certainly has a responsibility to soften the blow to our rural constituents who use electric and phone services. The REAct amendments adopted by the Committee could inadvertently cause undue hardship in the future and may prove unworkable.

Should rates rise above the statutory caps in the Committee amendments, (7% in the municipal rate program for electric and the cost-of-money program for rural telephone companies (telecos), then electric coops and rural telecos could face a situation similar to that of the early 1980s when the electric and telephone revolving fund was in fiscal crisis. At that time, repayments to the revolving fund at low rates were insufficient to service new government borrowings at very high interest rates. In the Committee package, interest rates above the statutory 7% lending rate may mean a restriction on the number of loans made. We are troubled by the possibility rural electric and phone companies could at some time in the future

not be able to fund their capital needs at any interest rate.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE

We have similar concerns about the crop insurance proposal that was offered in the Committee markup. With little discussion, no hearings, and no public comment, we are changing a basic risk management tool that producers and lenders currently appear to find increasingly suitable. Our concerns also are based on the experience some of us remember from crop insurance reform deliberations in the 101st Congress.

At that time, Members of this Committee discussed and debated at length two bills with completely different approaches to crop insurance reform. Neither was adopted, but this Committee with no more debate than was entertained during the business meeting of May 13th appears to have agreed in principle to a bill very similar to one that was found unworkable in 1991.

We are concerned we are being asked to undertake a major reform of crop insurance without allowing time for some of the reforms made in the program in 1990 to work. The Committee took steps in 1990 to improve actuarial soundness and to reduce the program's cost. With only two cropping seasons since those changes, adequate time has not been allowed to see if those reforms will reduce costs and improve the program.

In addition, the Federal Crop Insurance program changes adopted by the Committee would eliminate the premium subsidy to farmers who have been responsible risk managers and purchasing crop insurance. Instead the money being used for premium subsidies, plus an additional \$157 Million is spent to provide 35 percent catastrophic coverage to all producers. We question whether this low level of catastrophic coverage is enough and more importantly have concerns over the impact this will have on farmers ability to secure financing from lenders.

Aside from the policy considerations, the problem encountered in 1991 was cost. In 1991, it appeared from all angles that a program similar to the one included in this bill, would cost about \$1.1 billion annually, approximately \$300 million more per year than the baseline. We are concerned the \$157 Million, over five years, the Committee has siphoned off from other agriculture programs to fund this program will be insufficient. We are doubly concerned that the Committee in its haste to seize this opportunity and use this "new" money may adopt a program that was unacceptable a few years ago. There are legitimate policy and budget questions needing answers. While we are not opposed to considering this latest proposal, we would prefer an orderly procedure with balanced hearings and due deliberation.

PEANUT PROGRAM PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE IMPOSITION OF AN INTERIM TARIFF AND A SECTION 22 QUOTA UNDER THE AGRICULTURE ADJUSTMENT ACT

The Committee's recommendations to the Committee on the Budget provides for an additional 2% assessment on peanuts for the 1993 through 1998 crops of peanuts and extends the current (1%) assessment through 1998 to ensure that the peanut program remains a no cost program. The Committee is to be commended for meeting its instructions contained in the Budget Resolution on reductions in direct spending in this farm program, as it did for other farm programs, in a fair and balanced manner. However, section 1109(d) as explained in pertinent part in the section-by-section analysis (located earlier in this report) contained additional amendments relating to the peanut program.

"A second factor contributing to losses in the program is the continued quota-exempt importation of peanut paste and peanut butter. Although the importation of peanuts and peanut products is regulated under Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, a 1953 Executive Order signed by President Eisenhower exempts peanut butter from these restrictions. Peanut paste does not have this waiver, but the restrictions on peanut paste imports is not currently enforced by the U.S. Customs Service.

"Similarly, since the ratification of the Canadian Free Trade Agreement (Free-Trade Agreement), imports of peanut butter have increased more than 700%. Canada has a negligible to non-existent peanut production capacity. Most peanuts used to produce peanut butter in Canada are imported from China or Argentina. Transshipped foreign peanuts violate the rule of origin limitations contained in the Free-Trade Agreement. In some instances, the U.S. Government has identified the prohibited use of U.S. additional peanuts re-imported to the United States from Canada in the form of peanut butter or peanut paste.

"The loophole in the peanut restrictions of section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act should be closed. Section 1109 requires that a 55 cents per kilogram tariff be placed on all imported peanut butter and peanut paste. The increased tariff rate will expire on July 31, 1996. At that time, peanut butter and peanut paste will be placed under the existing Section 22 limitations established for peanuts and peanut products."

It is understood that the National Peanut Grower Group has submitted a letter to Secretary Espy earlier this year as allowed, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, claiming that imports from Canada and Argentina are tending to render ineffective or materially interfere with the Department of Agriculture peanut program. It is also understood that a task force in the Department has been studying this matter and will report its findings to the Secretary in the near future. If the Secretary finds that the imports of peanut products from Canada and/or Argentina are interfering with a loan, purchase, or other USDA program, the Secretary may so advise the President who, if he agrees with the Secretary, may cause an immediate investigation by the International Trade Commission or take other emergency action. Thus, it would appear that the peanut growers are pursuing a course to try to have the President address this problem as is set forth in current law.

It is also recommended that the Subcommittee on Specialty Crops and Natural Resources give consideration of holding hearings on this subject. Furthermore, the Committee on Ways and Means is urged to address this issue in an appropriate manner so as to review the claims made and concerns expressed by the domestic peanut growers.

However, the appropriateness of addressing this matter—at this time and in these legislative recommendations—is questioned based on amendments to the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (see section 1109(d)) that would not appear to be in our jurisdiction.

Mr. Boehner, a Member of the Committee, made a point of order objecting to the consideration of the matters in section 1109(d) during the Committee mark up of its recommendations to the Budget Committee (see excerpt below taken from the transcript of the business meeting):

"Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a point of order to the peanut provisions that are in the outline that were presented. The

Committee, with regard to those peanut provisions, is certainly overstepping our jurisdiction in imposing assessments on manufacturers which, in fact, become a tax. In addition, the increased tariff in the second part of the peanut provision that we've heard explained oversteps the Committee's jurisdiction in increasing the tariff on imported peanut butter and peanut paste. Finally, Mr. Chairman, the third part of that peanut provision relating to section 22 currently covers peanuts and what you are doing is you are adding peanut butter and peanut paste to that section 22. Again, all of these issues are under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means and I don't know how we can use these as part of our reconciliation letter."

The Acting Chairman, after some discussion, overruled the point of order and as a result Mr. Boehner proceeded to offer amendments to strike what he considered to be each of the three provisions that he submitted should be deleted from the House recommendations as they related to the peanut program. One of the amendments deleting the assessment on manufacturers who utilize peanuts in processing or manufacturing their product was accepted by unanimous consent and without objection.

Mr. Boehner's amendments to the other two provisions that remain in the Committee's recommendation (section 1109(d)) failed adoption on a "show of hands" vote.

It is believed a better course of action in this matter would have been to avoid a jurisdictional dispute with the Committee on Ways and Means as it relates to this matter. Although there would undoubtedly be some effect on revenue and costs based on the provisions in section 1109(d), apparently no such estimate was provided to the Committee by the Congressional Budget Office based on the jurisdictional confusion surrounding this matter.

It is recommended that in view of all the foregoing circumstances that the provisions of section 1109(d) be deleted.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, it would be one thing if this whole budget package were coming down the pike and prices for farm products were at reasonable levels, but prices were off 10 to 20 percent from last year. Our export picture is in shambles. We do not know about the Russian aid program. We do not know about GATT and NAFTA.

I will repeat again. If we are not successful in attracting more Members on that side of the aisle to defeat this Clinton budget package and it passes both Houses of Congress, we will be back within a year with an emergency farm package and an urgent dire supplemental. We do not need to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their contribution.

Mr. POMBO. Mr. Speaker, as a Member of the freshman class of this Congress, I am proud and honored to represent the people of the 11th District of California here in the House. But before I came to this Chamber, I was a full-time farmer in production agriculture, and to agriculture I will return one day. I have tried to bring that unique perspective with me to the Agriculture Committee.

And, as a farmer, I'm going to tell you that this budget reconciliation is going to be hard to sell back home, especially to our Nation's farmers.

The farmers I know are basic, hardworking, straightforward people. They speak simply and plainly. And the plain, simple truth is that this budget reconciliation package is cutting nearly \$3 billion from farm programs while, at the same time, increasing and expanding the Food Stamp Program by over \$7 billion. Those are the facts. Without the blue smoke and mirrors; without the rhetoric and window dressing, there is the reality that the supporters of this budget need to explain.

For me, it's easy. I voted against the budget reconciliation, and urged my colleagues to do the same. I voted in committee repeatedly to produce a more fair and evenhanded approach for agriculture. Each time the Democrat Party prevailed, leaving this farmer with no alternative but to oppose the final product. I wanted to see a budget that made the needed cuts, but did it in a way that shared the burden, rather than heaping the load ever higher on farmers.

As I said, for me the explanation of my vote is easy. For my Democrat colleagues, however, I can only wish you luck. To those who supported this budget, I want you to go, visit a farmer in your district. Put your foot up on the bumper of his truck, and tell him why the money being cut from crop insurance is better spent by expanding the Food Stamp Program. Or explain to him the equity of the Btu tax, or maybe the justice of the estate tax. I'd like to be there when you try. But let me give you a word of warning: don't do it near a running combine.

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to discuss the budget reconciliation process and its impact on agriculture.

I am confident that if Americans knew what happened in each of the authorizing committees a few weeks ago, they would be appalled. In one afternoon, the House Agriculture Committee legislated more changes in agricultural policy than we have in the 3 years that I have been here.

Little, if any consideration was given to the overall direction of our agricultural policy. The committee was told to come up with \$2.9 billion in savings—which would be offset by a \$7.3 billion increase in food stamps. Efforts to try to insulate the farmer from these cuts were rebuffed.

Attempts by Mr. ROBERTS and Mr. EMERSON to reduce the amount of the food stamp increase and withhold the \$7.3 billion until the welfare system is reformed, respectively, were rejected on straight party line votes. By rejecting these amendments, the committee preferred to spend now and probably pay more later as well.

MAJOR AMENDMENTS CONSIDERED BY THE HOUSE AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE TO TITLE I OF THE OMNIBUS BUDGET RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1993

1. Amendment by Mr. Roberts—Motion to instruct the Committee; increase food stamp spending by \$4.4 billion and use the savings to meet the \$2.9 billion from program spending cuts.

Explanation: The House passed Budget Resolution instructed the Agriculture Committee to decrease farm program spending by \$2.9 billion and increase food stamp spending by \$7.3 billion over the next 5 years. Essentially the Budget Committee told the Agriculture Committee to adopt the Mickey Leland Hunger Prevention Act.

Mr. Roberts' amendment was rejected by a vote of 17 yeas to 27 nays, recorded as follows:

Yeas: Mr. Roberts, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Smith, Mr. Combest, Mr. Allard, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Nussle, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Kingston, Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Dickey, Mr. Pombo, and Mr. Canady.

Nays: Mr. Brown, Mr. Rose, Mr. English, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Volkmer, Mr. Penny, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Sarpalis, Ms. Long, Mr. Condit, Mr. Dooley, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. Minge, Mr. Hilliard, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Holden, Mr. McKinney, Mr. Baesler, Mrs. Thurman, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Williams, Ms. Lambert, and Mr. Peterson.

2. Amendment by Mr. Emerson—deferred the \$7.3 billion in additional food stamp spending until Congress worked on and adopted welfare reform.

Explanation: Mr. Emerson argued that we shouldn't spend this additional money until the President submits a welfare reform package and the Congress has addressed the problem. The taxpayer could be better served by using some of the increased spending for training and employment programs.

Mr. Emerson's amendment was rejected by a vote of 19 yeas to 25 nays, recorded as follows:

Yeas: Mr. Minge, Mr. Baesler, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Smith, Mr. Combest, Mr. Allard, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Nussle, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Kingston, Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Dickey, Mr. Pombo, and Mr. Canady.

Nays: Mr. Brown, Mr. Rose, Mr. English, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Volkmer, Mr. Penny, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Sarpalis, Ms. Long, Mr. Condit, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Dooley, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. Hilliard, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Holden, Ms. McKinney, Mrs. Thurman, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Williams, and Ms. Lambert.

The Committee reported the Reconciliation package by a roll call vote of 26 yeas and 18 nays, recorded as follows:

Yeas: Mr. Brown, Mr. Rose, Mr. English, Mr. Glickman, Mr. Stenholm, Mr. Penny, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Sarpalis, Ms. Long, Mr. Condit, Mr. Peterson, Mr. Dooley, Mrs. Clayton, Mr. Hilliard, Mr. Inslee, Mr. Barlow, Mr. Pomeroy, Mr. Holden, Ms. McKinney, Mr. Baesler, Mrs. Thurman, Mr. Bishop, Mr. Thompson, Mr. Williams, Ms. Lambert, and Mr. Volkmer.

Nays: Mr. Minge, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Emerson, Mr. Gunderson, Mr. Lewis, Mr. Smith, Mr. Combest, Mr. Allard, Mr. Barrett, Mr. Nussle, Mr. Boehner, Mr. Ewing, Mr. Doolittle, Mr. Kingston, Mr. Goodlatte, Mr. Dickey, Mr. Pombo, and Mr. Canady.

These votes, when coupled with several other actions taken by the committee point out the need for serious controls on Federal spending. Increasing food stamp funding while reducing farm programs is not good policy. Nor is it consistent with a real commitment to deficit reduction.

The food stamp fiasco is just one of the antics that happened during the committee's consideration of the reconciliation package.

In addition, the committee included language on several provisions outside the committee's jurisdiction, and made several major policy changes based on nothing more than brief summaries. Such changes were made to the peanut program, the Rural Electrification Act, and the Federal crop insurance.

With regard to the peanut program, I made several attempts to strike certain objectionable

provisions from the package, however they were defeated along party line votes—even though they were clearly outside our jurisdiction. These provisions will have the effect of raising the price the consumer will have to pay for peanut butter. I find it kind of ironic that Congress would increase the funding for food stamps and increase the price of peanut butter at the same time.

These changes were not just minor or technical in nature. They put forth major changes in the operation of these programs. These actions were taken with little discussion, no hearings, and no public input. Hardly the way the democratic process is supposed to work.

Like many of my colleagues, I am committed to working for true deficit reduction. This package does not even come close to reducing the deficit. It is just another way to ensure that the pet programs of the majority are fully funded while asking the hard-working people of the Eighth District of Ohio for more of their hard-earned money.

If the savings found went to actual deficit reduction, I would have no problem with this package. However, we all know that these so-called savings will not go to reducing the deficit. Just like all the previous tax increases, these additional savings will only go to fund more Federal programs.

There is no doubt that the administration's proposals increases taxes by over \$3 for every \$1 in spending cuts. No one can refer to that as a real deficit reduction effort.

The reconciliation package we will consider later this week raises everyone's taxes without providing any long-term entitlement restraint. Ohioans who had hoped that the budget reconciliation process would begin cutting the deficit should be outraged.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, this body will soon deliberate and vote on a measure that will cause certain economic harm on American agriculture, many rural communities, and local jobs across the country. Clearly, this Nation's agricultural livelihood will soon suffer potential economic catastrophe as a result of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, if enacted. This issue is a timely one—particularly given all that our local farming communities have at stake under the President's budget recommendations.

Frankly, I am deeply concerned by the components of the President's economic plan—specifically the proposed Btu energy tax and the barge fuel tax or inland waterway user fee. I am also disturbed by the impact of the proposed budget cuts on production agriculture and related jobs. Unfortunately, it appears the narrow margin of profit on a bushel of corn, acre of soybeans, bale of cotton, or pound of pork or beef will get slimmer yet. The President's proposed tax increases and budget cuts will undoubtedly hit farmers where it hurts the worst—the bottom line.

We have proved to the rest of this Nation that American agriculture is willing to pull its share of the deficit reduction load. However, I now fear that the President's economic plan sacrifices the economic health of our rural towns and communities to pay for increased spending in other areas of the Federal budget.

Certainly, an increase in taxes will have a tremendous negative effect on this Nation's hard-working farmers and local agri-busi-

nesses. For example, this budget plan will increase barge fuel taxes by 250 percent, from \$0.19 to nearly \$0.70 per gallon. This tax increase will decimate the domestic barge industry which is so critical to farm producers in the Mississippi Delta region along with producers throughout the Midwest and South.

Equally important, the increased costs of the inland waterways fuel tax cannot be passed on to the end purchaser in foreign ports. Rather, the lion's share of the tax will be passed on to the local farmer in the form of lower prices for grain at the farm gate. By unfairly singling out this industry so vital to our Nation's transportation network, the new administration is prescribing a serious blow to the viability of American agriculture and local jobs.

This tax coupled with the Btu energy tax could easily cost more jobs in the agricultural arena than the package purportedly intends to create. Unfortunately, increased fuel costs through higher taxes on gasoline, diesel fuel, and propane on the rural consumer are just the beginning. Fertilizer, pesticides, herbicides, machinery, and even the tires on farm equipment will cost farm producers more through this energy tax proposition. Drying, ginning, and grain storage costs along with transportation and electricity expenses will also go up.

The local banker and farm credit office must also be considered. The reduced profitability of farming through increased taxes, higher costs, more paperwork, and added Government regulations will make the trip to the local banker more difficult than ever.

Adding another tax burden on the shoulders of farm producers and related farm industries won't balance the budget—it will only make a bad situation worse. Greater tax burdens—particularly in the nature of an energy tax—only rob from those hard-working men and women who spend their lives providing the food and fiber for the people of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, less Government spending is the answer—but it must be applied equitably and fairly. We must not and cannot balance the budget on the backs of the American farm producer. Clearly, this is one budget plan that we in rural America cannot afford.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues today in speaking out against the reconciliation package which is presented for our consideration. It is simply incomprehensible how this administration can ask the agricultural sector of our economy, which gets only seven-tenths of one percent of all Federal dollars, to make 3½ percent of all of cuts its budget calls for.

The whole reconciliation debate this week is going to be about fairness, Mr. Speaker, not partisanship. During that debate, a lot of tough questions are going to be asked about the fairness of this reconciliation package. And the first question on my list is, Is it fair to make hard-working American farmers take five times their share of budget cuts? The answer, Mr. Speaker, is a resounding "no!"

You know, every dollar we cut out of Function 350 is at least a dollar out of farmers' pockets around the country. And, quite frankly, farmers just might be willing to collectively give up \$2.95 billion of income in the upcoming 5 years if they could be assured that their sacrifice would result in genuine deficit reduction. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it won't.

By the Clinton administration's own figures, their budget will result in a 4-year budget deficit of \$1,290 billion—that's \$144 billion more than the entire deficit of the Bush administration, \$467 billion more than the second Reagan administration, and a whopping \$702 billion more than the first Reagan administration. Is it fair to ask farmers to forgo \$2.95 billion in income so that we can still have the largest 4-year deficit in our country's history? Again, Mr. Speaker, the answer is a resounding "no!"

Which, of course, leads us to the question of the hour—that is, if we're making all of these cuts and raising all of these new taxes, why is the Clinton administration running the single largest 4-year deficit in American history? One simply has to look at the reconciliation instructions provided to the House Agriculture Committee to find that answer.

Unbelievable as it seems, at the same time the committee has been instructed to take \$2.95 billion of income out of farmers' pockets, it has also been ordered to increase spending on the Food Stamp Program by \$7.3 billion. One would naturally assume that the justification for an increase of that size would have to be there are people who qualify for food stamps who aren't getting them currently and we need to increase spending on the program to accommodate these individuals.

Not so. The Food Stamp Program is an entitlement program and, as that title suggests, everyone who is eligible to receive food stamps does, indeed, get them. Instead, this \$7.3 billion is earmarked to fund various reforms in the program contained in the yet-unpassed Mickey Leland hunger legislation.

So, as you can see, the \$2.95 billion coming from farmer program cuts is not being used for deficit reduction purposes but is, rather, being directly diverted to new spending on programs such as food stamps. What makes this so onerous is that the Mickey Leland bill—as introduced by Budget Director, then Congressman, Panetta last year—has specific language which provides that "none of the provisions of this act shall become effective unless the costs are fully offset in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1996. No agricultural price or income support program administered through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Agricultural Act of 1949 may be reduced to achieve that offset."

Listen to that last sentence one more time, Mr. Speaker: "No agricultural price or income support program administered through the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Agricultural Act of 1949 may be reduced to achieve that offset." But that's exactly what this reconciliation package does here today—it takes \$2.95 billion of farmer income and reprograms it to the Food Stamp Program. Is that fair, Mr. Speaker? Again, the answer is a resounding "no!"

Instead of rolling over and playing dead on this issue, we ought to stand up to this administration and say "that's not fair and we're not going to let you make this trade-off." And that's exactly what we tried to do in the Agriculture Committee with the Roberts amendment which would have allowed \$4.4 billion of increases in the Food Stamp Program, but would have refused to make the \$2.95 billion in farmer program cuts needed to fund the re-

mainder of the changes requested in the Food Stamp Program. Unfortunately, that amendment was defeated on a party-line vote.

If we're going to take income directly out of the pockets of American farmers, the least we can do is use it for deficit reduction. That's why I and several other members of the Agriculture Committee have called for the establishment of a second trust fund into which savings from current program cuts can be placed for the sole purpose of deficit reduction rather than to fund spending increases on select programs. Short of that, Mr. Speaker, I don't see any way that a Member of this House can go back to his/her farmer constituents and explain why \$2.95 billion of their money has been taken out of their pockets.

Take my dairy producers for example. In the name of deficit reduction, we have cut Federal outlays on the Dairy Price Support Program from a yearly high of \$2.6 billion in fiscal year 1983 to a projected average annual cost of \$275 million over the next 5 fiscal years. Clearly, dairy farmers have done their part in the war against the deficit.

Yet, the dairy program is now expected to take another cut of about \$50 million per year over the next 5 years as part of this reconciliation package. Is it fair for dairy producers, who have already reduced annual expenditures on their program by 90 percent in the last decade, to be asked to take \$250 million out of their pockets simply to fund increased spending on food stamps? There is no doubt that the answer to that question is "no" and I will not support any package that requires them to do that.

Such funding reductions are particularly unfair in light of the new energy taxes that dairy producers will have to pay when President Clinton's Btu tax kicks in. This tax hits farmers disproportionately, all day and every day, directly and indirectly, gas, diesel, electricity, fertilizer, herbicides, pesticides, hauling prices, and processing fees to name just a few. Those of us who represent agriculture know that for every dollar of direct on-farm energy expense there's another dollar of indirect energy costs.

Economists for the National Milk Producers Federation originally estimated that the Clinton Btu tax would cost the small dairy farmer with 50 cows between \$575 and \$625 annually while the large operator with 500 cows would pay between \$5,750 and \$6,250 in new energy taxes.

With the very limited exception granted on diesel fuel, the small dairy farmer with 50 cows will still be paying between \$445 and \$520 in Btu taxes while the large operator with 500 cows would still pay between \$4,450 and \$5,200 annually for the privilege of using electricity and fossil fuels on his/her farm.

These additional farmer taxes are not only unfair when considered in conjunction with the cuts in Federal farm programs, but regressive as well because they hit disproportionately on farmers, low income families, and rural Americans. The Btu tax is also bad economic policy because, in a time of a fragile economy when we ought to be stimulating rather than discouraging investment, it taxes the one thing that touches virtually every aspect of our economic lives—energy. In the process, it hurts everyone—working families, small businesses, industry, and—most significantly—farmers.

As I stated in the opening of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, the question before us is one of fairness of the administration's budget and the House Budget Committee's reconciliation package. First of all, it is unfair to force a disproportionate share of cuts on one sector of the economy. Second, it is inequitable to go after a farm program that has already reduced its outlays 90 percent over the past decade in the name of deficit reduction. Third, it is unfair to impose a new, highly regressive tax on the individuals who have already had their Federal programs cut disproportionately. And finally, it is fundamentally unfair to take the savings associated with those cuts and the revenues received from those new taxes and channel these funds to new spending on food stamps and whatever else rather than using this money for deficit reduction.

I, for one, vigorously oppose this reconciliation package because of its inequitable impact on rural America. We need to stand up to this administration, Mr. Speaker, and insist on fairness. We should accept nothing less.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts made by Mr. ROBERTS, the ranking member of the Committee on Agriculture, in securing this time to address the effects of the Budget Reconciliation Act on this country's most endangered species: The American farmer. Some have made the argument that the President doesn't need to worry about agriculture because agriculture makes up only 2 percent of the population. However, this small percentage of the population brings a positive balance to our trade deficit, out produces any other nation, and provides the American public with a bountiful supply of food at low prices.

Agriculture needs more champions, like KIKI DE LA GARZA and PAT ROBERTS, the chairman and ranking member of the Agriculture Committee. As members of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, our responsibility is to work toward directing the spending for some of this country's vital programs dealing with agriculture, rural development, and nutrition programs. However, we have jurisdiction only for discretionary spending which comprises no more than 30 percent of the bill. Over 70 percent of the bill is made up of mandatory programs, such as food stamps, the School Lunch Program, and the Commodity Credit Corporation which are off limits.

If we are ever going to get a hold of this budget deficit crisis, we must be willing to grapple with the fact that these mandatory spending programs are inflating out of control. And it is going to take leadership from the President to urge Congress and the authorizing committees to break this gridlock by controlling mandatory programs. Otherwise Congress will continue to increase these programs in an irresponsible manner, as we are witnessing in the agriculture section of the budget reconciliation bill.

Let us remember agriculture anted up over \$57 billion in cuts in the 1990 farm bill and now is being asked to sustain cuts of \$2.95 billion from the USDA budget, further jeopardizing farm income. These are the same farmers who are already suffering from weak grain and commodity prices. At the same time, this plan would increase spending on food stamps by \$7.3 billion over the same 5-year period.

I do not have anything against increasing the level of spending for food stamps, but it

should not be done at the expense of the farmer. In fact, the Food Stamp Program has many inherent problems associated with fraud and abuse. When the inspector general testified at a hearing earlier this year, he mentioned that the Food Stamp Program is a very high-risk program which is costing this Nation millions of dollars due to fraud and abuse. Our committee is committed to working with USDA to remedy these abuses, but we need some more time.

We are exploring some very creative solutions, and given enough time to fully implement them nationwide, we can save millions of dollars. For instance, one of the most promising pilot programs is the Electronic Benefits Transfer Program being tested in the State of Maryland. A complete and thorough evaluation will be conducted, and if warranted, I suggest that this program be extended to other States with large occurrences of fraud and abuse. To throw another \$7.3 billion at this program before we address these problems of abuse is an abuse in and of itself.

I'm further disturbed with the Btu tax proposal which singles out the farmer whose energy consumption is the basis of all production. It has been estimated that the farmer can be expected to pay from \$1,000 to \$4,000 each year in additional taxes attributable to the Btu tax. To make matters worse almost \$40 billion in new spending for food stamps, the earned income tax credit, and low income energy assistance is needed to offset the harm done by this new tax. The farmer pays a disproportionate amount of the Btu tax, and then is also asked to bear the consequences of increased spending for the Food Stamps Program.

Farmers have paid more than their share toward reducing the debt over the last decade. It is unfair to ask them now to make another major sacrifice for a plan which makes very little progress on the deficit. Raising \$3.23 in taxes for every \$1 in spending cuts over 5 years is not going to address our huge deficit problems. We can do better.

Again, I commend Mr. ROBERTS for giving this issue the heightened awareness that it deserves. I look forward to working with him and the chairman of the agriculture committee to protect the most endangered species of all: The American farmer.

THE IMPACT OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know the hour is late and I will be somewhat brief.

Before I start my regular presentation, though, I want to respond to some of the comments made about the impact of the President's proposal on the agriculture community.

I had the great honor and pleasure to serve with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ROBERTS] on the Agriculture Committee in the last session of Congress. Clearly, the House is much better with the voice of the gentleman from Kan-

sas [Mr. ROBERTS] here. Clearly, agriculture is well served by his voice and advocacy in the House.

Many times we agree on many issues facing the farm families of America and the agricultural sector of this country. After all, it is one of those areas in my district, for example, that helps the balance of payments. We export a lot of products overseas. These are good businesses. They are involved in the domestic economy as well as very fierce international economy as well.

So I want to take a moment to talk about some of the items that are in the President's tax package for the American farmer.

The bill does allow small farmers to expense \$25,000 of their depreciable assets, instead of the current law provision of only \$10,000.

This allows farmers to buy another truck, help make the downpayment on a new tractor. The effect of that economically is to help stimulate the economy this year.

The bill does exempt farm use of energy from the extra supplemental energy tax, thus limiting the tax on farm uses of energy to the lower basic rate.

And yes, as was discussed this evening, there was a tradeoff from the subsidy, the roughly \$500 million subsidy that was going to the ethanol manufacturers and using that \$500 million in exchange for helping all farmers in our country.

Why is that? Why do I say it helps all farmers in this country? Because the farmers that benefited from the \$500 million ethanol subsidy are mainly in the Midwest.

I think a lot of the opposition to the exchange is coming from those Members who are representing their own backyards.

So we took them, as we serve on the Ways and Means Committee, we had a healthy debate on this issue, and we thought that it was fair to agriculture, in America, to spread this \$500 million throughout America by exempting all of agriculture from the extra supplemental energy tax.

In addition, those of us who are spokesmen and spokeswomen for the agriculture community did argue with the White House and other Members, quite frankly, from the urban areas about reducing the President's proposed inland waterways tax. The President proposed an additional dollar increase per gallon on waterway fuel uses. We were successful in getting that tax reduced by 50 cents per gallon.

There is a debate that the American public should know, that as other modes of transportation that do compete against waterways, waterway traffickers, such as the railroad industry and the trucking industry argued, that it is unfair to us, for us to pay a little bit more in the energy tax and exempt fully those who use the inland waterways.

□ 2240

Perhaps looking to success with the President's bill, perhaps the Senate may look a little more closely at the waterway provision and do a further reduction. But I do not think it is fair to propose that we would see complete elimination, nor should we see complete elimination of the President's proposed increase.

Remember that the President has talked about fairness, fairness across the board for all Americans, to help with his deficit reduction package, and that is what we are talking about here.

The bill also in terms of helping farmers, simplifies rules for filing estimated taxes. This will be especially helpful to farmers as it is difficult sometimes to predict what their incomes will be from 1 year to the next, and it would be unfair to penalize them if they did not correctly estimate the amount of taxes owed. And, therefore, we have gone to a much more simple procedure of collecting estimated taxes.

Also we have to keep in mind that, as long as we are involved in deficit reduction, that this is going to help farmers at the bank when they go to borrow money because deficit reduction is directly linked to the interest rates charged by the financial institutions, and, if we do not get control of this Federal deficit, as the President has urged, then we will see a rise in the interest rates, and that will be felt by every American, especially our farm folks who have to go to the financial institutions to obtain the money necessary to plant their crops and to harvest their crops as well.

So, I wanted to take just a few moments of time to talk about the good that is in the President's bill, that there are people on this side of the aisle who are very sensitive to the agriculture sector, and we tried to mitigate, as fairly as possible and as much as possible, some of the impact of the tax increases.

I do want to talk a little bit more about the problems facing America and why the President has taken the leadership role that he has. He recognized that, after 12 years of profligate spending, that the United States must get its economic house in order, that we saw from 1980 to 1992 a growth in the Federal debt from \$1 trillion, \$1 trillion, up to now \$4 trillion. Just in a 12-year timespan we have quadrupled the debt, so we cannot let business continue as usual in this country.

The other problem, in addition to the Federal debt and the Federal deficit that we face, that we are trying to address here in the President's plan, is the fact that we have a stagnant economy, and we have a recovery out of a recession that is not producing the number of jobs that recoveries in previous recessions created at this time in a recovery. And especially the good-

paying jobs whereby people can pay their mortgage or buy their first home, a job where there is a health care benefit, where there is a pension plan and some vacation time for the family. And I think all economists agree that the tools that we used to have to fight a stagnant economy do not exist today because of the huge Federal deficit, and I think that many, if not all, would also agree that, if we cut too much out of the Federal budget and in the wrong places, we will hurt economic growth.

Obviously, the best example is our highway system. We have to maintain it to conduct commerce in this country. We have to expand it as the economy expands as well. Highways are essential to moving commerce in this country. The same is true with our airports, as we know, and on the human service side it would be painful, painful, to ask the widow, American widow in this country whose only income is the \$400 a month Social Security check. Now that is an entitlement payment that she has earned, and there are many people in my district, too many, whose only source of income in their retirement years is that monthly Social Security check.

So, Mr. Speaker, we understand that we are in a very difficult situation economically, and with respect to human services, and that makes our task much more difficult, and we strive to make these Solomon-like decisions. The President in just his first few months of office has asked us all to make a very difficult decision, to, yes, cut spending, and I am going to talk about that, reducing the deficit. But he has also said we are going to have to raise some revenue if we truly—if we want to truly bring about true deficit reduction. So, that is why we have the plan before us. I think we have to step back and look at this overall big picture before we even look at the individual items that are being asked of people and entities that are being asked to pay their fair share of this burden.

So, I think that, if we take just a moment to talk about the spending cuts, it is very important because there is a lot of rhetoric on this floor in the past few days that Americans are writing in to all of us and saying, "Cut spending first," and the fact is we are cutting spending at the same time that we are raising revenue. That is why we call this the reconciliation bill, or piece of legislation, because we are reconciling our budget with the revenues, and so we are doing it both at the same time. And those who will be direct and honest with their constituents back home will explain to them this reconciliation process.

President Clinton this morning made an interesting observation to a group of us when he talked about the spending cut issue, and he said that many of the liberals in the Congress agreed, reluctantly agreed, to spending cuts, and

so there was not the controversy nationally in the press, for a few days even, let alone a few weeks, and even a month, about the spending cuts and the ramifications it would have for individuals in our society, whether they be elderly, on Medicare, whether they be a young child in need of health care or a student who is going down to get a school loan so that they can meet that college tuition requirement. This is going to happen as a result of cuts that were agreed upon without much controversy, at least, in the public. The President observed that, as a result of that, we did not have the national education that is sometimes necessary to show the public that, yes, we are cutting spending and we are cutting spending first. Those decisions were made prior to the Ways and Means Committee taking up the President's tax plan. The revenues and the tax plan come together in this reconciliation process.

Let me articulate specifically some of the spending cuts: The plan, the President's plan, gives over 30 specific cuts in Medicare and Medicaid that will reduce the deficit, reduce the deficit by \$56 billion. Yes, as we heard earlier this evening, agriculture entitlements will be cut by \$3 billion. Federal worker entitlements are cut by \$11 billion. There is a pay reduction in this for Federal employees in the amount of \$13.2 billion. Administrative cuts, \$11 billion. Cutting 100,000 Federal workers out of the system saves \$10.2 billion. Agriculture administrative cuts will save another \$1.1 billion. Consolidating overseas broadcasting services saves \$894 million. Streamlining education programs saves \$2.2 billion. Dozens of highway demonstration projects will save a billion dollars. We will eliminate certain special purpose HUD grants, tens of NOAA or National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration demonstration projects will be cut out of the budget.

□ 2250

Certain earmarked Small Business Administration grants are going to be eliminated, and unnecessary Government commissions are going to be told they no longer exist. These are specific items, specific cuts that the President has proposed and that the House has included in this budget reconciliation piece of legislation.

But there is the other side as well. There is the tax revenue increases. And it is difficult. The majority leader earlier this evening talked about how he hated taxes and he wished he did not have to pay any of them.

I have found in my short few days on the Committee on Ways and Means that it is always easier to tax the other guy. Find somebody else to tax.

Oh, yes, we have got to reduce the deficit. Oh, yes, let us raise some revenue to do it, as long as we cut spend-

ing. But tax the other guy. That is the message I kept hearing over and over again from the special interests that come before this committee.

So I think what we need to do as Americans is say OK, if we are going to have this tax increase, what do we buy for America with these tax increases?

No 1, and most important of all, is we buy deficit reduction. Our national security is threatened by the fact that we, the United States, are deeply in debt, in essence to other nations.

I think that today, 1993, the greatest single threat to our national security is our national deficit. Just as in World War II we had to take drastic measures, so too in 1993 must we take drastic and dramatic measures to eliminate this national security threat.

Second, deficit reduction means interest rates remain low, and hopefully can go even lower. I can tick off four reasons why deficit reduction, interest rates staying low, if not going lower, puts money back into Americans' pockets. Many are refinancing their homes today so that they are paying lower interest rates on their home mortgages, and this means more money in the pocketbook. It also means they are going to own their home at an earlier time. It also means that many Americans now can afford to buy their first home, so important to the American dream and our way of life.

Third, lower business loans. I mentioned that about our farmers, but all businesses in this country, when they go to the bank, whether it is the retail store that finances their inventory to the large corporation, lower loan rates mean a cost savings to businesses.

Fourth, our local governments will pay less interest money for the bonds they borrow to finance the new school building or the city that needs a new water treatment facility. It means a lower interest payment, and that should mean a lower property tax as that is the usual means to finance these local government bonds.

So there is a savings. There is a savings. There is money into the pockets if we do obtain deficit reduction, and you do that in part through these tax increases.

We also listened to the President when he said not only do we need to reduce the deficit, we also need to provide some investment incentives at the same time so that we can stimulate the economy in such a way that we are producing more jobs and more good paying jobs, and we have to have the business incentives to do that. So we are raising approximately \$35 billion more to pay for these big investment incentives.

What are they? Let me list them off. Targeted capital gains exclusion, \$1 billion. Is it as broad as I would like to see? No, but it does cost the Treasury, it does cost our budget dollars in the

short run, and we came up with \$1 billion for a targeted capital gains exclusion.

We have increased the incentives for real estate investment. This will cost the Treasury in the short run \$5 billion. But I think it will stimulate the housing market and the real estate communities as well, which will produce many more jobs.

We also increased the expensing for small businesses from \$10,000 to \$25,000. It helps every small business in this country. It is easily understood. It does not take an accountant or a tax lawyer to figure that out. Every small business person in this country understands it. But it also comes with a price tag to the Federal Treasury, and that price tag is \$8 billion.

We are increasing the research and development incentives for so many companies and industries in this Nation so that we will be competitive in an international economy. That has a price tag of \$13 billion. If we are not encouraging our corporations to invest in research and development, how can we compete against the Germans and the Japanese in this high-technology world?

So obviously this costs money. So that is why I say we are raising a little bit more than what we need in terms of our deficit reduction targets in order to help stimulate the economy as well.

We also modified the alternative minimum tax depreciation schedule so that we can help any of those very capital intensive industries with the problems that we have in this technical tax called the AMT that comes with a price tag of \$8 billion.

These business incentives add up to \$35 billion. We think, we believe, I agree with the President, that it is necessary to help the economy keep moving and to provide more jobs, which will help reduce the deficit further, if you will, in two ways. First, there will be less people having to turn to the welfare program; and, second, we will have more revenues in order to reduce that deficit spending.

So, as I said at the outset, we have to keep the big picture in mind. We have the deficit, and we have a sluggish economy without the kinds of jobs that are necessary.

Ms. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KOPETSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Ms. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman goes on, I know during the campaign there was a lot of conversation that went on about foreign companies participating in the United States. Maybe the gentleman can expand on this, because he touched on it a little bit on the research and development within the United States.

I believe there is a provision in here under the foreign tax for an American company that actually develops here,

researches here, but actually does production. There is now an incentive here to keep the production in the United States versus taking it overseas.

Mr. KOPETSKI. The gentlewoman is correct, that there is a provision to capture some of the moneys. I think what she is referring to is what is known as the deferral tax. Those corporations that defer their tax payments of moneys earned overseas, when they bring their dollars home, how much of it and what rate and how should it be taxed?

The President made that part of his campaign. He put that in his stimulus package.

What we are asking those international corporations is to pay a little bit fairer share of the moneys that they do earn overseas and bring home to the United States. So that has been taken care of as well.

Ms. THURMAN. If the gentleman would yield further, one of the things that I heard during the energy tax debate was that this is not just for deficit reduction, but it is kind of a rethinking for the country of how we are going to deal with sources of energy and what we need to be doing for our future that might not only affect us in what I might consider development of alternative sources, but also in helping with another deficit that we have not talked much about here, which is a trade deficit.

□ 2300

One of the things that I have watched over the years, probably back as far as the 1970's, the United States was like No. 1 in solar energy, which was one of our big products. We are now seventh in the world in production of solar energy.

It would seem to me, with some of the tax credits that you are talking about, with businesses for investment and incentives back here in this country, that this is also a time that they might be looking at building new businesses, such as solar energy to, in fact, offset some of the Btu tax. And if we got a little creative with this and then also used the tax incentives that were available to us, that we might see some new production, lots of good things coming out of this, if we look at it in the right light.

Mr. KOPETSKI. You are absolutely right. I think you make a very valid point about the energy tax and providing incentives to move more toward alternative energy rather than being a nation dependent on foreign oil.

Clearly, the Btu tax was heavily debated in committee, and it has been heavily debated on the floor.

I should say, it raises \$70 billion out of about \$350 billion of revenue or tax increases; \$70 billion of that is from the energy tax.

What is not taxed is very important. Alternative energy, solar and wind, is

exempt from the tax. So there is a tax incentive to invest in those kinds of technologies.

Cogeneration, energy that is produced from cogeneration, an energy waste today, but if you can harness that and use that steam plant that is maybe producing paper to also cogenerate electricity to run the factory, that energy produced is not taxed.

So there is more incentive, incentives for industries, especially our energy-intensive industries, companies, to move into this direction.

In addition, the biomass, conversion of biomass into energy is exempt from the tax as well. So we have now in place as part of energy policy an incentive to go in those much more benign and energy-efficient ways of producing, generating energy.

In addition, we try to reconcile the fact that different regions of this country rely on different sources of energy for transportation or home heating or electricity for their homes, whether used for air-conditioning or on the stove or the heating system. So if Americans stop and think about it, the Northeast is different from the Northwest, which is different from the Southeast and the Southwest. We each have energy which comes from different sources.

We may have a major source, such as nuclear power in the Midwest, or also use some coal, where out in the Northwest we use a lot of hydro and some coal.

How do you bring fairness nationally to this energy tax is a very difficult question. Compromise was made, and we did that. But the fact is, we are asking everybody to pay a little bit more, not everybody. I will get to that, because of the earned income tax credit, but we are asking a lot of Americans to pay.

This is a tax also that people can have some control over, because if they are using energy conservation devices in their home, wrapping the water heater, wrapping the hot water pipes, putting plastic over the windows in the wintertime and storm windows, and those kinds of things, that is going to save them on their energy tax bill. And that is good energy policy for this country, because as you well know, we are a nation that, once again, is over 50 percent dependent on foreign oil.

Mrs. THURMAN. I can relate another issue for you. In fact, in a townhall meeting that I had, there was some conversation about the Btu tax. And I suggested to them, being from Florida, or any place within the Southeast or the Southwest or any of those areas, that what we had looked at was in solar energy, if they just did one thing in their houses and that was to install a water heater, they could save as much as a third of their energy bill.

Now, a third of an energy bill, say, even a minimum bill of \$90 is \$30 that

they could save. The figures that I have seen is that somebody over 40,000 or under 40,000 is about \$10 a month. First, they have paid for whatever the increase might have been in their home heating anyway, and they probably, with over a 2-year period of time, would have paid for the installation of the solar energy heater, because they are about \$700 and coming down.

So it seems to me that those are the kinds of things we need to be talking about. They generate jobs, and yet they also give us some other alternatives to some of our other problems.

Mr. KOPETSKI. You are absolutely correct. The technologies are there.

It is not like we are waiting for a new technology to come along.

You go to other countries in the world, Israel, for example, they use a solar hot water heating device. There is no reason why we cannot be doing that in our sunshine belt in this country as well, and we ought to be doing it. There is a tax incentive to have it occur. I think it will occur.

So I thank the gentlewoman from Florida about those questions. They are clearly right on point. These are difficult decisions. It is difficult policy-making.

I think that if the American people, yes, we are all afraid of taxes; yes, we are afraid of the impact of some of the spending cuts that will occur, but I also hear from my constituents that say, we have got to balance our budget. We have got to get our economic house in order.

That is what this plan does. It is the most well-thought-through and thorough plan that is before the House. I do not think this is something that can wait. I think the House has got to move.

I have some charts I do want to close with, but before that, I want to yield to the gentlewoman from Georgia [Ms. MCKINNEY].

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman recognizing me. I also appreciate the service that he has put to the American people and for the American people on the Committee on Ways and Means. And in my talk earlier, we talked about the status of America's children.

Can you tell me what is in this reconciliation bill that will assist our children in at least not being able or not suffering from the preventable diseases of childhood?

Mr. KOPETSKI. I think that is an area of interest to a lot of Members.

We heard earlier this evening about some of the staggering statistics that you outlined in terms of this country and diseases that should not exist in the most powerful Nation on Earth, the wealthiest Nation on Earth, and yet we see, because we are not spending money on immunization, we see this vast increase in these diseases.

So what we are doing in this program is guaranteeing to every American

child the right to an immunization. It is very simple.

These children cannot make that decision for themselves. And at a national level, we are saying, it is so important to them as individuals that we are going to spend the money, close to \$2 billion, to ensure that happens.

Now, there is some criticism for the fact that we are also paying for the very wealthy in this country's children. Well, let us examine that a little bit.

I think the argument is made because of the fact that if a person does have a health insurance plan that the health insurance plan does not include immunizations, we will pay for it.

Another approach, therefore, would be at a national level to mandate that every insurance company include as a mandate immunization for children.

What the health care people will tell you, number one, we hate mandates, and they fight them in every State legislature. They fight it in the Halls of Congress, even a program as worthy as this.

And second, if you do mandate it, we will raise the cost to every policyholder in this country. There is no free lunch with the health care industry, believe me. They have a very powerful lobby.

The other example, the other reason given why we should not provide this to people is because there is a lot of working people that make \$30,000 a year, but they do have a health insurance program, but it is not covered in the plan, or they are working and they may not have health care coverage.

□ 2310

I think this is a very instructive statistic. Three-fourths of the people in the United States who are not covered by a health care plan are people in a family where one of the people is working, so these folks do not even have insurance coverage, let alone insurance coverage that includes the immunization program coverage.

Finally we talk about the super-wealthy in this country. I cannot imagine their not having a decent health care package that includes immunization programs, but maybe they are self-insured. Maybe they are, and maybe we would be paying for those people's children. My thought about that is yes, I guess we could set up a huge Federal bureaucracy to means test the children's parents to find out if they did hit that means level or not, and hire lots of bureaucrats and set up all kinds of means testing regulations, or we could just say:

Look, in this area children are the most important clients. We are going to spend the money on the child, regardless of how responsible or irresponsible that parent is.

What is the benefit to society, besides helping the children in our society? We know that it is going to save

us health care dollars as a Federal Government, so we are going to get this money back tenfold, I am willing to bet, because we have taken care of these diseases before they ever came into existence in a child's body.

Ms. MCKINNEY. That is absolutely wonderful. In fact, you know children are our most valuable asset, and we need to do everything that we can to divert our national attention to the status of children in this country. The statistics are appalling and are quite shameful for a country so wealthy as this one.

I would also like to just mention for half a moment that this is a piece of legislation that has a lot of support, and that we have organizations that represent literally millions of Americans who are in support of this legislation.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I would ask the gentlewoman if they are limited to the business side.

Ms. MCKINNEY. These organizations are as diverse as the American Agriculture Movement, the American Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, Bread for the World, the Child Welfare League of America, Coalition on Human Needs, Council for a Liveable World, Council for Rural Housing and Development, Families U.S.A., National Association of Homes and Services for Children, National Neighborhood Coalition, National Realty Committee, National Urban League, Women's Action for New Directions, Physicians for Social Responsibility, and the United Methodist Church.

Mr. KOPETSKI. I see you have about three pages of organizations.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Three pages of organizations, fully in support of the President's package.

Mr. KOPETSKI. Let me also say that as a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, we do have significant business support for this proposal as well. The fact is the President proposed increasing the top corporate rate from 34 percent, the current rate, to 36 percent. After a lot of public testimony and debate, we listened to the business community and instead of that 36 percent rate it will be at 35 percent.

Is it every business in America or every corporation in America? The fact is it is only the top 2,700 corporations in this country out of about 40,000 that do pay that top income rate.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take, in closing, just a few moments to show some of these charts that I have here, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, here we have a chart that talks about the changes in the average monthly taxes, the overall impact of the President's reconciliation bill, the bill that is before the House now.

As we see, and this includes the impact of the energy tax, of any kind of

further tax's effect on the average American, we see that those who make less than \$10,000, because of the expansion of the earned income tax credit, their taxes will go down, as will those making less than \$20,000 a year.

Those from \$20,000 to \$30,000 a year will see a \$3 a month increase in their taxes, and this is at the end, this is the accumulation, a culmination of the President's plan in 1998. All of this is phased in.

For the American family with a household income of \$30,000 to \$40,000, we are talking about a \$14 increase and a \$23 increase for families of \$40,000 to \$50,000; from \$50,000 to \$75,000, a \$41 increase; from \$75,000 to \$100,000, a \$64 a month increase.

Yes, for those who make over \$200,000, their monthly tax bill will go up about \$1,935. What we are saying is that we are reversing the trend that occurred in the 1980's and trying to be fair in asking every American, based on ability, to pay to help reduce the Federal deficit.

Does it hurt the millionaires? Probably a little bit, but I think I know two or three of these, actually, and I think they would actually say, "If it truly goes to deficit reduction, I am willing to pay."

I think that is the important point that we have to focus on, is that the world is not going to end for the middle income taxpayers if we pass this bill. Are they going to pay a little bit more? Yes, no question about it. Is it going to deficit reduction? Yes, no question about it.

This chart demonstrates in a different showing who is paying the taxes under the bill. You can see that 66 percent of it, the overwhelming majority of the tax bill, is going to those incomes over \$200,000. The next highest group are those who make \$50,000 to \$100,000. They will pay 20 percent of the share. Those from \$100,000 to \$200,000 pay 9 percent, and those with incomes under \$50,000 will pay 5 percent of the share of the American tax bill.

Finally, I think that it is important to conclude on this note, that this truly is deficit reduction. There has been a lot of rhetoric this week in the newspapers and on the floor about does it go to deficit reduction. There is no doubt about it. This orange line shows what happens if we do nothing, and this shows what happens if we pass the President's deficit reduction package. There is quite a gap here if we do nothing.

I think for all the reasons articulated earlier and by other speakers on this side of the aisle, that the American public cannot afford to do nothing. I commend the President for his leadership. This is not an easy vote for the Members of the Congress, there is no doubt about it, but those of us who will be voting "yes" will be voting for a sound, solid, secure future for our

American children, and for a sound, positive economic growth for our economy these next few years.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. LEACH (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of medical reasons.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. MORELLA, for 60 minutes, on May 27.

Mr. DOOLITTLE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. ZIMMER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DELAY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACCHUS of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEUTSCH, for 5 minutes each day, on May 25 and 26.

Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PICKLE, for 5 minutes each day, on May 25 and 26.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Ms. MCKINNEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BLACKWELL, for 60 minutes, on May 26.

Mr. RANGEL, for 60 minutes, on June 30.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BURTON of Indiana) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT.

Mr. BILIRAKIS.

Mr. COMBEST.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. KING.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana in two instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. SOLOMON in two instances.

Mr. CRANE.

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. ZELIFF.

Mr. HYDE.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BACCHUS of Florida) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. COLEMAN.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. FAZIO.

Mr. BORSKI.

Mr. OLVER.

Mr. STARK in seven instances.

Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

Mr. BERMAN.

Mr. RICHARDSON.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. FROST.

Mr. COSTELLO.

Mrs. SCHROEDER in three instances.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. MANTON.

Mr. SABO.

Mr. CLEMENT.

Mr. BONIOR.

Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

Mr. MINETA.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. KOPETSKI) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BISHOP.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.) under its previous order the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 26, 1993, at 11 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1282. A letter from the Department of the Air Force, transmitting notice that the Air Force plans to conduct a cost comparison of Air Training Command's Base Operating Support function at Columbus Air Force Base, MS, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1283. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period January 1, 1993 through March 31, 1993, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a (H. Doc. No. 103-90); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

1284. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting a report on proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1285. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the Government's helium program providing operating statistical and financial information for the fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 167n; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1286. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the Foundation's annual

report for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 19n, 19dd(f); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1287. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 1992, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4), 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1288. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to make permanent the authority of the Secretary of Commerce to conduct the Quarterly Financial Report Program; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

1289. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend the definition of the Office of the Under Secretary for Health to include health care personnel appointed to positions in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1290. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the transfer of 11 naval vessels to Argentina, Australia, Chile, Greece, Taiwan, and Turkey; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Foreign Affairs.

1291. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting notification that the National Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Management Plan will be submitted on October 25, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 102-218, section 9(b) (103 Stat. 1868); jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONYERS: Committee on Government Operations. H.R. 826. A bill to provide for the establishment, testing, and evaluation of strategic planning and performance measurement in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103-106, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROOKS: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2128. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize appropriations for refugee assistance for fiscal years 1993 and 1994 (Rept. 103-107). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ROSE: Committee on House Administration. S. 564. An act to establish in the Government Printing Office a means of enhancing electronic public access to a wide range of Federal electronic information (Rept. 103-108). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. KLECZKA: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 182. Resolution dismissing the election contest against Jay Dickey (Rept. 103-109). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. FROST: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 183. Resolution providing for considerations of the bill (H.R. 2244) making supplemental appropriations, transfers, and rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and waiving points of order against the bill (H.R. 2118) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1993, and for other purposes, and against its consideration (Rept. 103-110). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABO: Committee on the budget. H.R. 2264. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994 (Rept. 103-111). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 2245. A bill to establish a Permanent Performance Review Commission; jointly to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. ANDREWS of Texas (for himself and Mr. COLEMAN):

H.R. 2246. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives to encourage development in certain border areas; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BALLENGER:

H.R. 2247. A bill to suspend until January 1, 1995, the duty on 4,4'-biphenol; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DORNAN:

H.R. 2248. A bill to provide that petitioners for immigration classification on the basis of immediate relative status to a citizen shall be required to pay only one fee when such petitions are filed at the same time; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 2249. A bill to preserve the integrity of certain athletic competition in sports; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSH (for himself, Mr. FRANK

of Massachusetts, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. FURSE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WATT, Mr. WYNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. MEEK, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BISHOP, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 2250. A bill to establish the National Community Development Administration to facilitate community and economic development in low-income neighborhoods in the United States, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs and Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 2251. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the existing suspension of duty on fluazifop-p-butyl; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRANDY (for himself and Mr. NUSSLE):

H.R. 2252. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the existing suspension of duty on mercuric oxide; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HYDE:

H.R. 2253. A bill to require periodic assessments of the impact and effectiveness of U.S. economic assistance to foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LIGHTFOOT (for himself and Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota):

H.R. 2254. A bill to authorize the President to enter into an agreement with the Government of the People's Republic of China to establish a United States-China Bilateral Human Rights Commission; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MINETA:

H.R. 2255. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize and modify the State water pollution control revolving loan program and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 2256. A bill to provide emergency assistance to local public libraries for the purchase of books and other library materials and resources; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POSHARD:

H.R. 2257. A bill to direct the heads of Federal agencies to provide local resident hiring preferences in carrying out construction projects; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 2258. A bill to apply the expanded definition of disposable retired pay used for computation of the maximum amount of a former spouse's share of military retired pay to divorces that became final before the effective date of amendments made by Public Law 101-510 as well as those after that date; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas:

H.R. 2259. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the adjustment of levels of immigration to reflect changes in the unemployment rate of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SNOWE:

H.R. 2260. A bill calling for reduction in the U.S. share of assessed contributions to international peacekeeping operations, restricting the use of the U.S. Peacekeeping Emergency Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRANDY, and Mr. MCCREERY):

H.R. 2261. A bill to contain the rate of growth in health care costs and enhance the quality of health care by improving and making more efficient the provision of medical and health insurance information, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. UNSOELD:

H.R. 2262. A bill to authorize the conveyance of certain lighthouses in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WHEAT:

H.R. 2263. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the burden of Social Security taxes on lower and middle income individuals by allowing a refundable credit for a portion of such taxes, and to repeal the limit on the amount of wages subject to the employee OASDI taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 2264. A bill to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 7 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1994; committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

By Mr. KLECZKA:

H. Res. 182. Resolution dismissing the election contest against Jay Dickey; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

155. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to supporting the development of new roles for the military in Hawaii; to the Committee on Armed Services.

156. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to Federal emergency unemployment benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

157. Also memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the Healthy Families America [HFA] Initiative; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Energy and Commerce.

158. Also, memorial of the Senate of the State of Hawaii, relative to the formation of an Economic Conversion Task Force; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS of Texas:

H.R. 2265. A bill for the relief of Michael Patrick McNamara and Thomas Parnell McNamara, Jr.; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TOWNS:

H.R. 2266. A bill for the relief of Orlando Wayne Naraysingh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 39: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 109: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine.

H.R. 163: Mr. HASTERT.

H.R. 224: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 304: Mr. PAXON and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 417: Ms. LONG and Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 466: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. WALSH, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. BALLENGER, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 509: Mr. ROTH.

H.R. 518: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. VALENTINE, and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 559: Mr. VENTO, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 749: Mr. KLEIN, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 769: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 773: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 799: Mr. REED.

H.R. 822: Mr. FISH and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 844: Mr. KLEIN and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 881: Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. SWETT, Mr. HORN, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illi-

nois, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 882: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 891: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 911: Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 923: Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 935: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FALCOMA-VAEGA, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 972: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 983: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1003: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1006: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1036: Mr. TORRES, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 1080: Mr. COBLE, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 1133: Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. LEACH, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 1141: Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 1154: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1155: Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 1164: Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 1171: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1182: Mr. TRAFICANT and Ms. SHEPHERD.

H.R. 1254: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MEEK, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. BEILSON, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1272: Mr. SPENCE.

H.R. 1277: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 1293: Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1332: Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 1353: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. HERGER, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1355: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. LINDER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1404: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 1405: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1421: Mr. BECERRA and Ms. DELAUNO.

H.R. 1459: Mr. LINDER, Mr. ROHRBACHER, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1496: Mr. MACHTEY, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. DREIER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BAKER of California, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1500: Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1509: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 1520: Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1523: Mr. COX, Mr. PETRI, and Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 1524: Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 1525: Mr. PETRI and Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1532: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. PETRI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1533: Mr. PARKER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mrs. CLAYTON, Miss COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 1539: Mr. COLEMAN.

H.R. 1573: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. KLING, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1583: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 1698: Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 1709: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 1795: Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 1829: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 1877: Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DORNAN, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. EVANS, Ms. MALONEY, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 1887: Mr. PENNY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PARKER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1890: Mr. OWENS and Mr. BAKER of California.

H.R. 1897: Mrs. MINK and Mr. FORD of Michigan.

H.R. 1904: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1905: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1906: Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 1935: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. CLAYTON, and Ms. BYRNE.

H.R. 1948: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2053: Mr. ARMEY and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 2076: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. FROST, Mr. DEFALZO, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2135: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. LAROCO, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 2136: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2154: Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona.

H.R. 2190: Mr. DORNAN.

H.R. 2201: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 2202: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2203: Mr. RICHARDSON and Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.

H.R. 2204: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 2205: Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 2219: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. PETERSON of Florida.

H.J. Res. 44: Mr. PACKARD and Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H.J. Res. 78: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. OBEY, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. COX, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FLAKE, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HAMBURG, Ms. CANTWELL, Ms. LAMBERT, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. LEVY, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. FURSE.

H.J. Res. 92: Mr. CAMP.

H.J. Res. 122: Mr. DURBIN.

H.J. Res. 133: Mr. HILLIARD.

H.J. Res. 135: Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. DICKS, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. OBEY, Mr. DARDEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SHAW, Mr. PETE GEREN, Mr. YATES, Mr. QUINN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. REED, Mr. SHARP, and Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

H.J. Res. 139: Mr. LEVIN.

H.J. Res. 148: Mr. LANCASTER.

H.J. Res. 187: Mr. MANTON, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. COBLE, Ms. MALONEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STOKES, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. GINGRICH, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, and Mr. NATCHER.

H.J. Res. 194: Mr. TUCKER, Mr. WALSH, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WELDON, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.J. Res. 195: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. DEFALZO, Mr. TORRES, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. MATSUI.

H. Con. Res. 66: Mr. JACOBS.

H. Con. Res. 95: Ms. SHEPHERD.

H. Con. Res. 100: Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BEILSON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. LEVIN, and Mr. SAWYER.

H. Res. 47: Mr. STUMP, Mr. KLUG, Mr. CRANE, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. PAXON.

H. Res. 151: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. BLUTE.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1295: Mr. COPPERSMITH.